Labour Monthly

EDITOR R. PALME DUTT

A MAGAZINE OF INTERNATIONAL LABOUR

UNITED OFFENSIVE FOR VICTORY

PRINCIPAL CONTENTS

Notes of the Month

United Offensive for Victory by R. P. D.

Central Strategy by IVOR MONTAGU

Vichy versus the People by QUAESTOR

Stiffen the Sinews by WILLIAM RUST

Indian Deadlock by K. S. SHELVANKAR

The New Christian Socialism by REV. AMPHLETT MICKLEWRIGHT

Egidio Gennari

Mr. H. G. Wells and Communism by THE EDITOR

and

Book Reviews

DECEMBER 1942 VOL. 24 No. 12

6D

Editorial and Publishing Offices: 134 BALLARDS LANE, LONDON, N.3 Telephone: FIN. 5135

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

READERS WERE PLEASED . . .

Messages of congratulation poured in this last month. The office telephone kept ringing. The 'phone calls were from readers expressing their pleasure with our special number on the Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the Russian Revolution.

And now—let us harness this enthusiasm! As the philosopher Socrates said "By discussion we discover the truth." Don't wait until the name of your town appears in the list. Every group has a beginning, and more groups have been started by one reader gathering together his or her friends and acquaintances. Take the initiative and write to the Discussion Groups Organiser, who will be only too glad to assist you in forming a group in your district.

LABOUR MONTHLY
DISCUSSION GROUPS

(Places in **BOLD TYPE** are new Groups. Places in *italics* are projected Groups)
(Please send STAMPED ADDRESSED ENVELOPE for particulars)

LONDON AREA

Acton, Barking, Barnet, Beckenham, Bethnal Green, Burnt Oak, Chiswick, Clapton, Colindale, East Ham, Edgware, Enfield, Forest Gate, Fulham, Golders Green, Greenwich, Hampstead, Harringay, *Hammersmith*, Highgate, Holborn, Ilford, Kensington (North), Kensington (South), Lambeth, Leyton, Marylebone, Morden, Palmers Green, Putney, Southfields, Twickenham, Walthamstow, Wandsworth, Wembley, Westminster, Willesden, Winchmore Hill, Woodford.

HOME COUNTIES

Addington, Amersham, Ashtead, Banstead, Basingstoke, Beaconsfield, Bishops Stortford, Braintree, Brentwood, Bromley, Buckhurst Hill, Burgh Heath, Bushey, Bush Hill Park, Caterham, Canvey Island, Chelmsford, Chingford, Claygate and Esher, Crowthorne, Croxley Green, Didcot, Dunstable, East Grinstead, Epsom, Gerrards Cross, Goring-on-Thames, Gravesend, Grays, Greenford, Guildford, Harold Wood, Harpenden, Harrow, Hayes (Middlesex), Hertford, *High Wycombe*, Hillingdon, Hitchin, Hornchurch, Horsham, Kenton, Letchworth, Maidenhead, Maidstone, Maldon (Essex), North Harrow and Rayners Lane, Orpington, Pinner, *Pitsea*, Princes Risborough, Radlett, *Reigate*, **ROYSTON**, Ruislip, St. Albans, Sevenoaks, Shadoxhurst, Shoreham, Slough, Staines, Sunbury-on-Thames, Upminster, Wallingford, Wallington, Watford, Welling, Welwyn, *Wickford*, Windsor and Eton.

PROVINCES

Abercynon, Aberdeen, Aberystwyth, Abertillery, Alfreton and Ripley, Alexandria, Altrincham, *Amber gate*, Andover, Ashford (Kent), Assington, Ayr, Bacup, Banbury, Barnstaple, Bath, Batley, Beaumaris, **BEBINGTON AND BROMBOROUGH**, Beccles, Biddulph, Birkenhead, Birmingham, Blackpool, Bognor Regis, Boston, Bournemouth, Bridgend, Bristol, Buckhaven, Cambridge, Cardiff, Cardigan, Carlisle, Castle Douglas, Castleford, Cheadle, Cheltenham, Chester, Chippenham, Chorley, Cleveleys, Cirencester, Clevedon, Clifton (Bristol), Cockermouth, Cwmllynfell, Cudworth, Darton, Dawley Bank, Derby, Doncaster, Dunoon, Edinburgh, Exeter, Farnborough (Hants), Farnham, Fawley, Folkestone, Glasgow, Gloucester, Grantham, Greenock, Guiseley, Halifax, Heanor, Hebburn, Hereford, Huyton, Hyde, Ilkley, Inverurie, Jarrow, Kendal, Kidderminster, **KILBIRNIE**, Leeds, Leicester, Lemington-on-Tyne, Liverpool, Llanelly, Llangollen, Lowestoft, Macclesfield, Malvern, Mansfield, Marple, Merseyside, Middlesbrough, Milngavie, Minehead, Milton, Morpeth, Moss Park (Glasgow), Neath, Nelson, Netley, Newark, Newcastle-on-Tyne, Newcastle (Staffs), New Mills, Newtown, *North Kelsey*, Northallerton, Nuneaton, Penrith, Petersfield, Pluckley, Portchester, Portsmouth, Preston, Radford (Notts), Rawtenstall, Reading, Renton, Rhondda, Rugby, Ryton, Saffron Walden, St. Helens, Salisbury, Saltcoats, Scunthorpe, Sedgeley, Sheffield, Shrewsbury, Skipton, Somerton, Stafford, Stockport, Stoke-on-Trent, Stornoway, Stroud, Sunderland, Swindon, Talgarth, Taunton, Thornliebank, Thorpe, Thurso, Tonypandy, Tonyrefail, Tunbridge Wells, Walsall, Wareham, Warrington, Warwick, Wednesbury, Wellingborough, Westbury, Whitstable, Wick (Caithness), Winchester, Witney, Wolverhampton, Woodbridge, Worcester, Worksop, Worthing, Wrexham, Yarmouth, Yeadon, Yeovil.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOTES OF THE MONTH

The New Offensive—Changing the Face of the War—A New Spirit—Lessons of 1942—*The Turning of the Tide—Stalingrad—The Lost Opportunity—Vindication of Second Front Campaign—An Impermissible Gamble—New Tasks To-Day—Everything for the Front—Unified Allied Strategy—Speed and Initiative—Political Strategy—Darlan—French Anti-Hitler Front—India—Reactionary Dangers—Battles in Front—Towards the Final Offensive.*

THE new war situation, which is developing with the Anglo-American offensive in North Africa and the new Soviet offensive in the Stalingrad region and the Caucasus, places on us great responsibilities. Deep as is the universal welcome for the new offensive and the successes won, this is no time for jubilation, for over-estimating the speed or ease of victory, or under-estimating the still formidable strength of the enemy, entrenched in the fortress of Nazi Europe, with his claws deep in the vital regions of the Soviet Union, and with the far-flung Japanese menace in the Far East. The attack launched by Britain and the United States in Northern Africa is a preliminary, initial stage; the heaviest battles are in front.

THE strength, speed and vigour of the new Soviet offensive, immediately following the African offensive, emphasises the opportunity now on our side to extend the offensive and redouble the blows against the harassed enemy. The development of the operations which have now opened will test to the last reserves the strength and endurance, the solidarity and unity, the speed of action, the capacity for sacrifice, the fighting power, the productive power, the strategic leadership and the political leadership of the United Nations. Hence the unwisdom of premature jubilation or blind over-confidence at the first initial successes, when all our efforts need to be directed to the speediest victory and extension of the present offensive, in order to be able to advance as rapidly as possible to the decisive united offensive of the Allies for final victory over the power of Hitler and his satellites.

BUT, given that understanding of the seriousness and urgency of the situation, there is every room for recognition of the great and inspiring change which this opening of the offensive and the initial successes won have wrought in the war situation. It is the beginning of action. It is the turn from the defensive to the offensive. It is the seizure of the initiative by Britain and the United States. It is the first step to the combined action and offensive of the Allies whose unity will bring victory. And therefore this beginning has already changed the face of the war, not merely by the direct scope of the operations engaged, but by the inescapable significance and consequences of the new phase of the war thus opened.

NOT the least important of the effects of the new offensive is its influence on morale, on the spirit of the people. The ending of passivity and

Vol. XXIV. No. 12

CONTENTS FOR DECEMBER

December, 1942

		Page
Notes of the Month—*United Offensive for Victory*	*by* R. P. D.	357
Central Strategy	*by* IVOR MONTAGU	363
Vichy versus the People	*by* QUAESTOR	369
Stiffen the Sinews	*by* WILLIAM RUST	374
Indian Deadlock	*by* K. S. SHELVANKAR	377
The New Christian Socialism	*by* REV. AMPHLETT MICKLEWRIGHT	379
Egidio Gennari		381
Mr. H. G. Wells and Communism	*by* THE EDITOR	383
Book Reviews—		
Indian Light on the Indian Problem	*by* CLEMENS DUTT	386
Guides to the Far East	*by* PAGE ARNOT	38[illegible]
The Law and the War and Shorter Notices	*by* S. MURRAY	

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the launching of this first initial combined offensive of Britain and the United States has brought new confidence to the United Nations, and alarm to the camp of Fascism and its satellites. It has strengthened the ties of alliance of the United Nations, at a time when the prolongation of delay was bringing grave dangers. It has brought closer the sense of direct participation of the American people in the common struggle against Hitler. For the British people, the greatest impetus has come from the ending of the long months of impatient waiting and inaction, of the years of setbacks and reverses, of the calls to sacrifice and produce without any visible major fighting front other than the Eastern European front of the Soviet ally, with the consequent tendencies to moods of frustration, cynicism or scepticism. The change-over to action, the seizing of the offensive, the successful planning of the combined operation, the demonstration of the capacity of British arms and fighting men to defeat the Nazi forces, has produced an electric effect alike in the factories, in the armed forces and throughout the nation; and the influence of this has already shown itself in the sphere of production.

THE African offensive needs to be seen against the background of the whole war, in relation to the other fronts of the war, especially the new developing Soviet offensive, the future perspective of the war and the needs of a united allied strategy. 1942 has been without a doubt the crucial year of the war, the year in which the decisive change in the balance of forces has taken place. That decisive change, that turn in the tide of the war, has taken place, it can now be clearly seen, thanks to the strength of the Soviet stand, which has made possible the present offensive. The seventeen months stand of the Soviet Union armed forces in isolation against the assault of the entire Nazi military machine at the peak of its strength has in fact transformed the war, even though at terrible cost.

THIS seventeen months' stand has disorganised Hitler's plans, pinned his forces in the East and crippled his best fighting divisions. It has inflicted a total of no fewer than eight million casualties on the enemy forces, as recorded in Stalin's Order of the Day on November 7. This total of eight millions put out of action means, as Mr. Churchill stated in his speech to the House of Commons on November 11, that the Red Army has "killed or permanently put out of action far more millions than Germany lost during the whole of the last war"—that is, during the four and a quarter years of the first world war against a coalition of Britain, France, the United States, Russia, Italy and Japan simultaneously fighting Germany on every front.

ALL future ages will stand aghast at this record without parallel in the history of war, and will unite in paying tribute for all time to this revelation of the heroism, endurance and invincible strength of the men and women of the new social order who could achieve this gigantic task for the salvation of humanity. But they will also stand aghast at the lack of unity of allied strategy, which could make so desperate and costly a conflict a bitter necessity as the only means to break Fascism, when in fact superiority of resources and man-power was all the time on the side of the Allied coalition, but remained unused. This achievement, culminating in the epic of Stalingrad, which will be recognised in the record as the turning point of the war, has cleared the way for the present new phase of the war and the initial offensive launched by Britain and the United States, with the great new possibilities which now open out.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE year 1942 has been the year of the decisive turn in the war. But it has also been the year of lost opportunity; and the understanding of this fact, even as we enter the new phase, must sharpen our resolve not to repeat past errors, but to make the most of our chances in this new phase in order to ensure and hasten the maximum and decisive united action. Had the Soviet stand been accompanied by the Second Front in 1942, not on an equal scale with the Eastern Front, but sufficient, as indicated in Stalin's speech, to draw off sixty Nazi divisions and twenty satellite divisions (contrasting with the eighty Nazi divisions which the Soviet Union held immobilised on Germany's Eastern European frontier during Britain's year of "isolation" in 1940-41), there is no doubt that 1942 could have been also the year of final victory over Hitler. That opportunity was not taken; and we shall have to pay a heavy price for this in the coming year.

THE campaign of the popular anti-Fascist forces, conducted since the summer of 1941, when any decisions taken would have had ample time for execution, and pursued with a rising tempo through the spring and summer of 1942, for the speediest establishment of the Second Front in Europe within the year 1942, with the aim of victory in 1942, reached a considerable height and powerful mass backing—not unlike the comparable pre-war popular anti-Fascist campaign for the British-French-Soviet Pact which could have prevented the present war. Like that pre-war campaign, it fell short of final success. The campaign was not finally strong enough to prevail against the giant forces of passivity, scepticism, bureaucratic delay and pro-Fascist sabotage and open opposition. The "ruse" of the pledge announced in June undoubtedly also lulled wide sections of supporters of the Second Front from pressing their demand in the subsequent months, as the Trades Union Congress vote in September revealed. The verdict of history is likely to vindicate the justice of this campaign, as it has already vindicated the justice of the Peace Front anti-Munichite campaign of before the war. But the context of this issue, though not its essential content, has now been vitally changed by the new situation, and the campaign for a united strategy and the establishment of the Second Front in Europe needs now to be carried forward in relation to the new concrete realities of the present situation.

THE delay of the Second Front in 1942 was, in fact, a very reckless gamble on the capacity of the Soviet Union in isolation to hold the entire Nazi assault right through the critical months of 1942. Had Hitler succeeded in his plans of attaining his Eastern objectives in time to be able to turn considerable forces West—and by any normal military calculation, against any other enemy, with all the advantages he held on his side, and with an unmolested rear, such an outcome might have been judged inevitable—it would be a very different picture to-day. There would have been no African offensive, but instead an overwhelming Nazi assault to the West. The menace to Britain would have been even more grave than in 1940, since the powerful protective rôle which the unbroken Soviet strength was then able to exercise in favour of Britain would have been no longer able to operate in the same way under the new conditions, on the assumption of Hitler having succeeded in his aim of crippling the immediate Soviet striking power in 1942.

IT was, indeed, an impermissible gamble. Only the miracle of Stalingrad saved Britain—a miracle of human will defying facts, reason, caution, common sense, expediency, probability and every other consideration dear to professional

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

military staffs. But no serious military strategy should calculate on miracles from others, while discounting as impossible or too risky even moderately difficult enterprises from its own side. The plain analysis of Stalin's speech on the question of the Second Front in the West in 1942 holds, and in its sober statement of facts anticipates already the historical verdict as clearly as his speech of the spring of 1939 anticipated already the historical verdict on the approaching war. The very halting and slightly contradictory apologetic explanations of President Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill, following Stalin's speech, can hardly be expected to carry conviction, and mainly confirm the contrary argument by the facts they reveal.

BUT the lost opportunities of 1942 are no longer the present practical issue. The alternative strategy was chosen, which delayed the main offensive, and preferred to initiate action on the more limited basis of Africa, as a preliminary to further blows and the planned offensive in Europe. This way also can lead us to our goal, even if at greater cost, provided the follow-up is speedy and effective and does not allow the initiative to be lost. The African offensive is not the Second Front; but it is the first stage of an offensive whose vital strategic importance is evident, not only in relation to Africa and the control of the Mediterranean, but in relation to Southern Europe, its effects throughout Europe, and the inevitable extensions to which it gives rise. The speed and intensity of Hitler's countermoves demonstrates the importance attached by the Axis to this offensive and their anxiety to counter it. The African offensive strengthens the conditions, just as it increases the urgency, for the speediest establishment of the decisive European front. Our main concern must now be to do everything to ensure the success of the African offensive and to hasten the launching of those decisive blows which, in conjunction with the Soviet offensive, can most rapidly lead to the final defeat of Hitler.

NEW tasks and new responsibilities follow on the offensive which has now been launched in its initial stages, and the war of movement which shows signs of developing and further extending. The initial strategic aim to destroy the German and Italian Fascist forces in North Africa and establish Allied control of Northern Africa has still to be achieved. It is evident that the Axis is concentrating its forces for further battle, and has no intention yet of regarding Northern Africa as lost. We can have no excuse for allowing our wishes to outrun the facts. After the preliminary Allied successes, the main battles for the control of Africa and the Mediterranean are still before us. The first immediate concern of the people of this country must necessarily be for the success of the African offensive, for the speediest victory of the African offensive, and for the strengthening of war production, especially in coal, steel, shipbuilding and guns, tanks, planes and munitions to ensure the supplies for the rapid rate of consumption on the African front and the other fronts already in existence or likely to develop in the near future.

AT the same time the question of the effective unification of Allied strategy becomes all the more urgent, as the initiative begins to pass into the hands of the United Nations. At present three main offensives are in progress: the Anglo-American offensive in Africa; the Soviet offensive west of Stalingrad and in the Caucasus, reaching to the Don; and the action against Japan in the Pacific. But there is no evidence yet of a concerted major strategy to utilise the maximum combined forces of the United Nations so as to deliver the most effective

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

blows, both in place and timing, against the enemy, and finally rob him of the power of initiative. The counter-strokes which Hitler is preparing on the basis of his still unchallenged hold in Europe may yet bring unpleasant shocks; and Japan holds a similar menacing strength on the borders of India, so long as the situation in India remains unsolved.

SOME recent speeches, holding out the perspective of 1944 as the possibly decisive year, suggest still that policy of leisurely procrastination and assumption of an automatically mounting superiority which has led to so many disappointments in the past, and which fails to take into account the decisive factors of speed and continuously renewed initiative if the potential superiority of the United Nations is to be made effective. We may hope that the further developments as they unfold themselves of the plan of the present offensive will show that these lessons have been learned, and that the initiative will no more be allowed to pass back into the hands of Fascism. Whatever local successes may be won, the fortunes of the war will continue indeterminate until such time as the main offensive of the main Anglo-American forces can be launched, no longer only in outlying colonial regions, but on European soil, so as to engage major Nazi forces, release the action of the European peoples on our side and combine with the Soviet offensive for the final defeat of Hitler. All our efforts need to be directed towards this key objective.

EFFECTIVE unification of strategy is not only a question of unification of military strategy. It means also that political strategy must be combined with military strategy. This issue becomes the more important, as the first signs begin to appear of disintegration of the Hitlerite coalition, and as we approach the prospect of decisive blows against the fortress of power of Nazism and its satellites, releasing the action of the enslaved peoples as partners of the United Nations. This issue has been brought to a head with the present official recognition of Darlan in French Northern Africa, which has been justly taken up by public opinion as a key question for the whole character of our strategy and the whole character of the democratic anti-Fascist aims of the war.

WHILE striving for the unity of the national anti-Hitler front in every country, and for the unity of all sections and representatives genuinely opposed to Nazi domination, whatever their social and political outlook, we cannot allow false and misleading arguments of military expediency to be misused for reactionary political purposes, when these in fact bring, not added strength, but weakness and disunity to the cause of the United Nations. Governmental recognition of Quislings can only encourage our enemies and alienate our friends; can bring no added basis of support, but only a liability, hindering and disorganising the formation of the national anti-Hitler front, and spreading doubt and distrust of the purposes of the United Nations among the masses of the peoples opposed to Nazi domination.

IN the test case of Darlan, the dangerous divergence of Allied strategy has been glaringly illustrated, when, at the very moment of the crucial offensive in French Northern Africa to lead the way to the liberation of France, at the very moment most manifestly requiring the united mobilisation of the French people, the Allied radio stations should be simultaneously broadcasting appeals to the French people, in the name of Darlan, to support Petain and Vichy, who in fact support Hitler, and in the voice of de Gaulle, the representative of French resistance to Hitler, denouncing Darlan, Petain and Vichy. In the place of a united

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

voice of the United Nations, with the most trusted French representatives speaking in their name, a divided voice, with one of the most hated French traitors and collaborators of Hitler speaking in the position of honour and power, and controlling administration under the protection of Allied bayonets. This is to spread demoralisation, which can only serve the interests of Hitler. President Roosevelt's explanation has not removed the scandal, which can only be ended by the withdrawal of recognition from Darlan, and the constitution of the broadest representative French national anti-Hitler front or provisional council, around de Gaulle and all proved representatives of the struggle for freedom against Hitler, and in close association with the mass movement in France. The democratic anti-Fascist representative character of all the exiled European Governments needs to be similarly strengthened at this critical moment, in order to prevent the recurrence of similar disastrous situations in the future.

THE urgency of this task of political mobilisation of the nations for the approaching decisive phase of the struggle against Fascism applies no less strongly to the question of India. Recent events have shown every day more strongly how unjustifiable is the present so-called "deadlock," and how artificially it is, in fact, being maintained, not only by the refusal of negotiations between the British Government and Indian representatives, but even by vetoing negotiations between the representatives of the major parties and political sections in India, for fear they might reach agreement. This is the final shameful culmination of the present official policy, of the policy of "Divide and Rule," with its suicidal blindness to the urgent military realities of the situation. The labour and democratic movement in this country has here a pressing responsibility which it has not yet fulfilled—a responsibility in its own vital interests and in the interests of the struggle of the United Nations. The broad front of the peoples against Fascism in the Far East can only be built on the basis of the free co-operation of the Indian and Chinese peoples in association with all the United Nations.

WE cannot afford to under-estimate the dangerous rôle of the reactionary pro - Fascist, near - Fascist, Munichite or isolationist forces, as the decisive phases of the struggle against Fascism draw closer into view. Their activity increases and is bound to increase, as they find themselves faced with the prospect of the final downfall of Fascism. They seek to take advantage of every military setback or political difficulty in order to weaken national unity and prepare the ground for alternative policies. Faced with the initial successes of the African offensive, they have sought to utilise these against the necessity of the Second Front in Europe, to set one front against the other, or to argue that the African offensive replaces or rules out the Second Front in Europe. They seek to play up to those Empire isolationist tendencies which fail to comprehend the world character of the struggle, which interpret British interests in terms of the maintenance of Empire domination in Africa, the Middle East and Asia, and regard Europe as of secondary concern. Such an outlook plays straight into the hands of Hitler's strategy for the disruption of the front of the United Nations.

IF Hitler were to find himself in increasing difficulties through the advance of Anglo-American strength and the success of the African offensive, and through the failure of his plans in Eastern Europe and the advance of the Soviet offensive, he might well try to buy off defeat by a new approach to such elements in Britain and the United States to propose a compromise peace on the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

basis of maintenance of his conquests in Europe. Only strengthened national unity can prevent such a betrayal and surrender, which would leave Hitlerism in power and prepare terrible consequences for the peoples of the world. Hence the importance of driving out now from political influence the pro-Fascist forces, and strengthening the deomocratic anti-Fascist character of the Government in readiness for the decisive struggle against Hitlerism.

WE are undoubtedly approaching the culminating phases of the struggle against Axis Fascism. But we must, above all, beware of overconfidence. We are only at the veriest beginning of the new phase of the offensive; and nothing has yet been done compared to what lies before us. The power of the Nazi machine is still strong to deal many dangerous blows, and can now also turn back the still weak tide of advance, if we fail in any respect in maximum united effort and in achieving a united Allied strategy. The heaviest battles are before us, which will impose the sternest tests, and demonstrate the still formidable strength of Nazism and expose every unsolved weakness in the alliance of the United Nations. Hence the urgency of our present tasks in response to the offensive which has been launched.

R. P. D.

Central Strategy

by IVOR MONTAGU

WHAT is the means of defeating the Axis forces? The Second Front in Europe.

Premier Stalin has explained it with the masterful clarity typical of all his analyses. He has set it out as simply and incontestably as the proposition that two and two makes four. Germany has 256 divisions. Against the Red Army are fighting 179 German divisions, 22 Rumanian, 14 Finnish, 10 Italian, 13 Hungarian, 1 Slovak, 1 Spanish—240 divisions in all. The remaining forces of Germany and its satellites are spread out on garrison duty in the conquered countries, with a handful in Libya.

The Red Army and the Soviet people have proved strong enough to sustain the assault of 240 divisions and to deny them their objectives. Subtract x from 240 and you get the number of divisions that the Red Army will be strong enough actually to overcome.

The central task of all the Allies must be to mount strategic operations that will subtract that x. Stalin says x equals 80—60 German and 20 satellite divisions. The recipe for victory is as straightforward as that.

All operations must be assessed by the criterion—how far and how fast do they contribute toward the realisation of that central aim?

Despite their public professions, the British and American Governments preferred not to approach their task directly in 1942.

Instead they adopted a roundabout, indirect alternative.

The brilliant carrying-out of the first steps—the masterful victory in Egypt, the skilful organisation and swift execution of their landings in North Africa—these have enormously multiplied the possibilities and reduced the difficulties of the eventual task.

What are the perspectives obviously and almost immediately led up to by the North African operations, characterised by Stalin as constituting "a radical change in the political and war situation in Europe in favour of the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition"?

1. The exposure of what Mr. Churchill called the "soft underbelly" of the Axis. The accessibility of the southern European coastline, as well as the northern and western, to Allied attack.

2. The consequent necessity for Hitler to extend his defences to cover that added coastline, a very long one, forcing him either to withdraw troops from Russia or to spread those he has more thinly.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

3. The demoralisation of the quislings, the disintegration of the "New Order" by inducing its accomplices to speculate on means of escape.

4. Discouragement of the German forces, whose "legend of invincibility," ineffective at Moscow, now proves inadequate against other troops. The sample of the change in balance of forces constituted by the beginning of the deployment of U.S. strength.

5. Added confidence for British troops and invaluable experience in land-air-water co-operation for both British and Americans.

6. Increased vulnerability of Italy.

7. Masking of Spain. Spain becomes relatively isolated, so that the playing by Hitler of the card constituted by his puppet Franco should be more easily coped with by the Allies in the future than it could have been in the past.

8. Probable relief to the Red Army, not yet totalling the value x necessary to release its full offensive power, but none the less a measure of invaluable relief in that direction.

9. The rousing of France. The further isolation of those French Fascists who continue in Hitler's service.

10. Release of Middle East troops from the defensive rôle in which they have been held hitherto.

11. Possible eventual easing of the strain on shipping. Though only experience will show how far the use of aircraft as defensive umbrella to make the south Mediterranean route hugging the coast practicable may not be an uneconomic one, and indeed, how far the shipping needs of supplies by direct route to the huge armies now on the North African coastline may not equal the needs of the indirect route to the far smaller army in Egypt hitherto.

Against these prospects Hitler can set only a defensive strategy, forfeiting initiative. The only aggressions left to him, extension of his invasions west through Spain or east through Turkey, are already operations that would increase his eventual vulnerability, creating new fronts to be defended, spreading his troops still thinner. Further, the sphere in which he must develop defensive strategy, mount tactical preventive attacks, etc., to cope with the strategic threat deriving from North Africa, is very far distant from the concentration of his crack troops and crack commanding staffs, all bogged in Russia.

A word of warning. It must not be lost sight of that this catalogue of prospects still lies, in large part, in the future. Rommel is not yet out of Tripoli. Tunisia is not yet occupied by the Allies. The full prospects for the Allies will open up only when the whole coastline is in their hands. Meanwhile, delaying operations have been mounted by the enemy. Hitler is fighting out the issue—are the Mediterranean islands in his possession to become bridgeheads from which he can constantly gnaw at the Allies in North Africa, or are they to be the vulnerable outposts of the Europe he must defend against the Allies? But in any case, and already, the actual operations around that issue are bringing huge advantage to the Allies. For the forces they engage are almost entirely troops previously not thrown in, while for Germany the contest, especially in the air, must use up forces previously required for other dispositions. The progressive decline of German power relative to that of the Coalition has begun.

Hence Stalin's words—that the new Anglo-American operations open the perspective of the "disintegration of the Italo-German Coalition in the nearest future."

What are the prospects of these possibilities being realised? What are the prospects that the operations in Europe which alone can distract the full necessary tally of x divisions will speedily be reached?

To answer this question a brief retrospect is necessary. We must first pose the question: why has the alternative strategy been adopted, Why has the direct operation in Europe not been mounted hitherto?

The explanations of the American President and the British Prime Minister on this point do not coincide.

Roosevelt's press conference statement two days after the landings (November 10) said that North Africa was a Second Front, if a "smaller" one, and gave the following time-table for the abandonment of the decision to open the Second Front in Europe in 1942. Military and naval opinion had held before May that it would be feasible, he said. Later, doubts arose. In May and at the beginning

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of June an alternative was considered. By the end of June* there was general agreement that the place should be Africa.

This account does not fit in very well with the known dates. For example, it was on June 11 that the White House declared, regarding the Molotov •conversations: ". . . full understanding was reached with regard to the urgent tasks of creating a Second Front in Europe in 1942. . . . Both sides state with satisfaction the unity of their views on these subjects."

The less hasty and more detailed account by Churchill to Parliament does not ignore the public pledges, or attempt to suggest that North Africa is yet their fulfilment in a "small" sense.

Not very much attention needs to be paid to that part of the Prime Minister's statement in which he justifies deceit of the Allied peoples by the non-fulfilment of the pledges on the score that the enemy also was deceived. The plain fact is—the enemy was not deceived. We do not need to take Hitler's word for it. ("Take heed, they say, turn about, the Second Front is coming. We have not taken heed. We have not turned about. We have advanced." Speech of September 30.)

The fact is, however, that indeed he did not look back. No divisions were withdrawn from East to West. Churchill's claim that 33 divisions were stationed in the West corresponds not too badly with calculations from Soviet sources.† But a number something of this order would be required for garrisoning recalcitrant Europe, irrespective of any invasion threat. Note that, according to Mr. Churchill's own claim, while Britain and U.S.A. are at war with the Axis as the Soviet Union's allies, and conducting their Second Front Pledge bluff at full blast, 33 divisions are all that this detains in the West of Europe, while throughout the period during which it is now fashionable to boast that Britain "stood alone," before June 22, 1941, Hitler kept 80 stationed in the East. This is a measure at one and the same time of the service of Soviet strength and neutrality against Hitler domination even before June 22 and of the ineffectiveness of the Churchill vaunted "deceit." It is further of interest that Mr. Stimson, U.S. Secretary for War, stated categorically on November 12, in conflict with Mr. Churchill, that the Germans were not deceived, and evidently knew of the impending landing in North Africa.

Of much greater importance are the reasons given by the Prime Minister for the change of plan. The decision was purely military, he implies. In the end he became convinced that for 1942 the cross-Channel landing was not "physically possible."* He gives the impression that the military advisers convinced him it would lead to "great disaster" and he accepted that view.

This is wholly incredible as an explanation. Quite apart from the failure to mount the operation having let slip the opportunity of ending the war in 1942, as Stalin has shown, it cannot but be clear that—in purely military terms—the risk of not mounting the assault was bound to be far greater than any involved in the attempt at the operation itself. It was, in fact, nothing less than the risk of greatest disaster of all, the risk of defeat to the whole Allied cause. In preferring their alternative, the British and American Governments gambled on the Red Army. They speculated on its holding out alone. Had it not been for Stalingrad, where to-day would be the fortunes of the Allies, the boasted Roosevelt-Churchill strategy, the whole outlook in North Africa?

As Mr. Maisky said on November 14 to the Students' Conference: "What would have happened if the U.S.S.R. had been defeated this summer? Most probably by now it would have been the Germans, and not the British and Americans, who would have descended on Africa, east and west, and huge German forces would have been gathering for the final assault on the shores of the Channel and on the borders of India."

* Not until the end of August did Churchill go, with the assent of the War Cabinet, to "explain" to the Soviet High Command this change of plan.

† With this distinction, however, Soviet sources, enumerating and identifying the divisions, claim that about one third are reserve divisions and another third "shadow" divisions not at full strength, *i.e.*, lacking artillery, etc.

* General Smuts, at his Press conference on November 13, put it differently. "Awkward, if not impossible," was his phrase for it. "Awkward," is, of course, not a serious objection to such an operation, and further, it is a word that can cover difficulties not limited to the strictly military.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

That was the risk run by these so clever military experts who wanted to avoid risks.

Rommel would have been reinforced, the Middle East armies would have been on the defensive, the French North African Fascists confirmed in their allegiance to Hitler as the winning side. "What upset the German plans?" asked Maisky. "I need say only one word: Stalingrad."

No, Churchill's explanation that the abandonment of the proclaimed strategy was for purely military reasons won't wash. The purely military motives weigh all the other way. The real explanation is that politically the conceptions of the Second Front in Europe entertained by the Soviet High Command on the one hand and by certain circles in Britain and America on the other are very different.

Clues to the situation emerged from Sir Samuel Hoare's speech to his constituents. This certainly let the nose of the cat out of the bag.

The Soviet conception of the Second Front in Europe is of an operation, not necessarily successful at its own end, but which results in general victory by subtracting the necessary *x* divisions from the East, thus leading to the defeat of the balance by the Red Army. To contribute to this end the Soviet command sees the forces of Hitlerite Germany embarrassed by the necessity to cope, not only with whatever Anglo-American forces contrive to land, but with the synchronised actions of the oppressed peoples enraged by the oppression of the invaders and their Fascist quislings.

Certain circles in Britain see the matter very differently. Sir Samuel Hoare revealed that he had busily reassured continental friends who came to see him in Madrid (no one, of course, could travel across Europe or visit with impunity the British Embassy there unless they were *persona grata* to the Nazis and to Franco—which shows who Hoare's "friends" are) that the Anglo-American forces when they landed would do so in strength enough to prevent "anarchism" and "murder" (which, in the context, could only conceivably have signified: overthrow of puppet Fascist regimes and just punishment of quislings). In other words, to these circles the defeat of Hitler would be a disaster if accomplished by the Red Army and resulting in the liberation of Europe. Well aware that the Second Front in Europe must lead to Hitler's downfall, they saw its opening as an operation not to be undertaken unless and *until conditions were favourable* for racing past the Siegfried and Maginot lines to Berlin ahead of the Red Army. Having banked on Hitler to preserve reaction in Europe, and found that they had raised a monster content with nothing less than the subordination to him of their own power as well, they set themselves the task not of freeing Europe, but of eliminating Hitler and inheriting his task of protector to the New Order.

Only a child could suppose it a coincidence that the chief opponents of the Second Front in Europe in 1942 were the chief advocates of sympathy for Hitler in the days before the war, the chief past advocates of Fascism, the chief supporters of appeasement, the chief backers of the Spanish rebels, the hardest and most merciless reactionaries in internal politics, the most bitter and determined enemies of the Soviet Union, the Kemsley Press, the Friends of Franco, the Astors, the Tory monopolists, the Right Wing Labour leaders.

To estimate the prospects now of victory we have to realise that these circles still exist and will still exert their pressure. The further necessary steps to victory will not come of themselves, but only by unrelaxing and vigilant struggle against the influence of these circles.

The splitting of the Vichy Fascists by bribery in North Africa, the U.S. banking experts' visit to Franco* and the subsidy and territory promised to the latter†—while Franco pays the expenses of his division on the Russian front—the Myron Taylor mission to the Pope, the effort to enlist support of Catholic Fascists by selling the freedom of the populations subject to them—these things all show very clearly the power to influence method enjoyed by pro-Fascists in high position to this day.

* Warren Lee Pierson, President of the U.S. Export and Import Bank in Madrid, October 15.

† President Roosevelt's promise of help to preserve cultural treasures and the British-U.S. notes undertaking not to interfere with the Tangier *status quo* (*i.e.*, seizure by Franco).

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A deal with Darlan is all very well if the scoundrel brought a fleet or an army with him. He could be hanged later, when Hitler is disposed of. But the whole history of the Washington State Department's relations with Vichy and De Gaulle respectively makes nonsense of the story that the idea of the deal was an extemporary brightness on the part of the local U.S. commander of troops. Just as the undeniable fact that it was Darlan's cronies in North Africa who did their best to slay the Allied liberators and the rank and file and lower decks who welcomed the Allies makes nonsense of the pretence that the deal served any military expediency. And just as Darlan's own appointment of a Legislative Council and statement that he is appointed High Commissioner by agreement of the U.S. forces and will "determine the goal" in accordance with the instructions of the Marshal makes nonsense of the "temporary" in Roosevelt's reassurance to a wondering world.

Meanwhile, the harm done is colossal. The national unity achieved against Fascism and the invader by the subjected peoples of the Continent is disillusioned and discouraged. Those risking their lives to sabotage co-operation with Hitler are offered an object lesson that the traitor tyrants who hate and fear them may receive a new propping from the "liberators" when Hitler's is withdrawn.

Further, the delaying policy deriving cannot be pursued without increasing cost. A winter breathing space for Hitler enables him to exploit the resources of his "Fortress Europe"—to which is now added the previously Unoccupied Zone of France—to fortify its defences, bleed to death the opposition of the enslaved peoples, repair his exhaustion by the spring. Tenfold will become the eventual cost of his reduction. Yet worse, delay gives the possibility to manoeuvre for the elements desiring to save Fascism by a peace-switch for the Hesses, Thomas and their friends. Delay is the field in which the elements of discord between the Allies find their scope to play.

Without incessant activity by the working-class movement, the would-be rescuers of Fascism will be left with a free field to influence the naval and military authorities. Only working-class and anti-Fascist determination here and in U.S.A. can strengthen the U.S. and British Governments to prevail against them.

Already on July 3, 1941, Stalin declared that the Soviet "war for the freedom of our country will merge with the struggle of the peoples of Europe and America for their independence, for democratic liberties."

This process is, of course, dialectical. It has two sides.

The significance of Stalin's prediction, examined in relation to the problems of the Second Front in Europe in 1942, is that common struggle brings common interests to the fore, and the experience of common struggle strengthens the democratic tendencies in Britain and the U.S.A.

The converse is equally true. The long delay produced the opposite effect. We saw in Britain the anti-Soviet cobras daring once more to raise their heads and shoot their venom from their mouths. We have also seen Hoare daring to make his speech and Halifax using the slogan of "Christianity" as a subtle wedge between the Allies. Fascists, scarce bothering to drape themselves with a disguise, emerge to call for Hitler to be saved. Sempill, late chief of the Anglo-German Fellowship, declares himself and scores of peers waiting for the moment to advocate peace by negotiation.

In U.S.A., where up to now the involvement in the war has been far less, these groups, hiding often behind "military expert opinions," advocacy of "the Pacific First," accusations that sacrifice is unnecessary for the war and called on only owing to administration incompetence, together with out-and-out anti-Soviet incitement, are more brazen, powerful and active. To interpret U.S. affairs it is necessary not to transpose slogans automatically to the English background; in U.S. setting they have often a very different significance. In some mouths, for example, "Second Front now" is only the U.S. counterpart of the policy attached in Britain to Moore-Brabazon's name. Here diehards desire that Germany and U.S.S.R. should so mutually weaken one another that Britain is left dominant in Europe. There, this far from satisfies their American counterparts. These desire American forces to concentrate on Pacific pickings and Britain to start in Europe on its own,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

so that with the U.S.S.R. and Germany Britain may be weakened also, and leave the U.S. dominant. In some mouths, attacks on the Atlantic Charter as incomplete and demands for Indian "freedom" merely veil a complaint that Roosevelt should drive a harder bargain with the British Empire and a demand for the traditional Open Door policy of American Imperialism. "Freedom" for a colony in such schemes is mere demagogic terminology for the demand that the Empire owning it shall no longer have power to restrict U.S. trade with it. It is as a strengthening of these tendencies, not only hostile as between Britain and America on the one hand and U.S.S.R. on the other, but as between Britain and America themselves, that the calamitous successes for the reactionaries in the U.S. elections must be understood. They are the inevitable result of the delay in developing the active fight, a dung in which such dissensions spore like mushrooms. This is not the least of the dangers to be apprehended when Stalin warns that delay in establishing the Second Front may "end badly for all freedom-loving countries."

It is this situation which has now been transformed. The action at last undertaken jointly by the British and U.S. troops does politically weaken the disruptive forces, and immensely strengthen the democratic ones, as Stalin predicted. The fact that American troops are in action exposes to mass anger the "military authorities" in U.S.A., whose project was to build a single-handed army for the future, rather than co-operate in joint operations here and now. The demands and logic of the new situation itself weaken their position. "*L'appetit vient en mangeant*" applies particularly to military operations. The tactical logic of the North African move *requires* development to Europe. Advocates of inaction in 1942 could prate of risks involved in any undertaking. Advocates of inaction now already plainly risk the operations already begun and gains already won. As the operation develops the need for co-operation with the European peoples and the insufficiency of bargains with their traitor rulers will become steadily more obvious from experience. The pretexts of insufficient shipping or ineffective arms or incapable leadership, so often cited to justify delay, have been blown sky-high. The Government bluff of only appearing to undertake the action demanded by the people will not be easy to repeat. The Prime Minister himself has spoken of how far advanced are the preparations for a cross-Channel attack, divisions trained, boats and ports prepared. The Soviet Armies will increasingly shake the stability of the main German forces. The stage is set upon which mass pressure against the delaying circles can be exercised most favourably.

The objective conditions for victory have been created. Hard battles, work and sacrifice still lie between to-day and its achievement. The speed and sureness with which we reach victory depend upon the working-class movement availing itself of its opportunity and raising its activity above the level of 1942.

BOUND VOLUMES 1921-1941

We are continually receiving requests for bound volumes for earlier years which we are obliged to refuse, as we have not the loose copies available to make up sets. Can readers help to supply the shortage? The numbers required are :—

1921, 1922, 1923 : All numbers.
1924 : March, December.
1925 : May, December.
1926 : March.
1929 : March, December.
1930 : All except February.
1931 : August, September, December.
1932 : March.
1933 : March, May.
1934 : April, October.
1936 : December.
1938 : July.
1939 : All except March, November, December.
1940 : January, February, March, November.
1941 : June. (With covers on.)

We will pay for copies of these months returned in good condition before the end of the year.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vichy versus the People

by QUAESTOR

AMONG the great changes brought about in Europe by the Allied campaign in North Africa which Stalin pointed out to Mr. Cassidy, Moscow correspondent of the Associated Press of America, in his letter published on November 14, was the following:—

"That campaign releases France from her state of lethargy, mobilises the anti-Hitler forces of France and provides a basis for building up an anti-Hitler French army."

The development of the North African campaign has brought various and conflicting emotions—elation and enthusiasm at the heavy defeat of Rommel and the occupation by the Anglo-American forces of great stretches of North Africa; at the same time, confusion, bitterness and suspicion at the intrigues which aimed apparently at building up round Admiral Darlan, only yesterday Petain's right-hand man, a new substitute French Government. Yet through all these conflicting and clouding feelings the underlying facts of the situation in France, and the beginning of a change for the better in France's rôle in Europe, must not be forgotten or be obscured.

What was the feeling in France, on the eve of the African campaign? Innumerable acts of sabotage by the French people against the invaders and their agents, constant repressions by the Nazis and the Vichy Government, are familiar to all readers of the newspapers, and tell their own tale. But it is worth quoting at some length a report on public opinion in France, dated June of this year, published by such an extremely moderate source as the Fighting French Headquarters in London ("Les Documents," November 1, 1942).

So far as the peasantry are concerned, collaboration of the big landowners with the Germans has brought no result. "The prisoners don't return, the situation in the countryside gets worse." Although agricultural prices have risen, the farmers have found it impossible to benefit by high prices: "A purely peasant France has begun to mean for them no shoes, no clothes, no tools, no agricultural machinery, no string, no artificial manures. . . . Parallel with this, they see the Germans making huge requisitions, not only of agricultural produce properly so-called, but of what the peasant considers to be means of production—horses, fodder, lorries, gas-driven vehicles, etc." The immense majority of the peasants in the Occupied zone have now as their only hope the victory of the Allies.

In the former Unoccupied zone, the report notes, there was rather more confusion. The immense majority of the peasants were anti-German, but many thought the Marshal (Petain) was a great man in the grip of a rotten government imposed by the Germans. But as economic conditions showed no improvement, feeling against the Vichy Government in practice became as strong as against the German authorities in the Occupied zone.

Among the workers in both zones, the report notes, there is no halo around the Marshal: almost all the workers are both against collaboration with the Germans and against the policy of Vichy. A number of reasons are listed, such as the treachery of many manufacturers who not only co-operated with the Germans, but took advantage of the occupation to crush out the last traces of working-class freedom: the attempt of the Vichy Government to enlist workers for Germany: the bad food supply in the towns: and the fact that both the Germans and the Vichy Government use the discredited renegades as intermediaries for dealing with the workers. The entry of the U.S.S.R. into the war "re-created the unity of the French working class."

The great majority of Frenchmen treat the manufacturers as having betrayed their country, says the report—partly because of the numbers who have taken advantage of collaboration with the Germans to make profits, and partly because, in both zones, they look upon the existing authorities as a bulwark against the danger of Communism. Nevertheless, the report notes that in small scale and medium industry there are very many manufacturers disgusted with Vichy as much as with the Germans, and ready to make sacrifices for the liberation of their country. Much the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

same situation exists among the majority of the retail traders.

One could reinforce this estimate from many very varied sources. Thus the monarchist *Action Francaise* published a letter from a reader on September 4 who had just been on a visit to the village of X, and complained: "This village is typical of what is going on everywhere in Central France. There is conspiracy against the French State, united by bonds of interest, habits and stupidity, by Communists, Freemasons and Jews, while a few good neutrals look on in fear and trembling . . . The gendarmerie is the only police force here. Outside their headquarters you actually hear the broadcasts of the English radio. If a house-to-house search is undertaken by the police, somebody is always warned in advance." Four days later, the renegade Radical Deat, in his paper the *Oeuvre* (published in Paris), wrote in a revealing lamentation: "The dangers which surround us are immense. Gaullism is rampant everywhere, whether it springs from a bourgeois conservatism, or a pseudo-revolutionary idealism, or whether it is the late flowering of democratic ideas, or the rotten fruit of internationalism. It exists in all our civil services, in the police, in the army, in the Unoccupied zone, in North Africa, in East Africa. It shows itself in hold-ups and sabotage, in plotting and conspiracy. It filters into the press in spite of the Ministry of Information and the censorship. It is according to place and time Sovietophil, Anglophil, or Americanophil, taking as patron saint Churchill, Stalin or Roosevelt, according to taste."

The one thing which was lacking in this situation, attested by such differing sources in identical terms, was (in the opinion of the secret report mentioned earlier) "the mobilisation of French opinion for a well-determined action." And as Stalin pointed out in the letter to Cassidy, it is precisely this mobilisation that has been brought by the Anglo-American campaign in North Africa. For the first time all the saboteurs, plotters and propagandists of whom the German agents complain have the certainty that they have become allies of a real menace to German occupation and its lackeys, in the shape of a real army, navy and air force inflicting heavy blows on the enemy at the very gates of France.

Next to the actual German occupying forces—the Nazi Army and the Gestapo—the main enemy whom the French people, awakening from its lethargy, meets in action is not the hired bravoes and reptile journalists subsidised by the Germans in the former Occupied zone. It is the huge machinery of repression and corruption which has hitherto masqueraded under a French exterior, and which is centred in the Vichy Government headed by Marshal Petain. This man and his group intrigued with the Germans, through Franco as well as directly, in order to bring Republican France into mortal peril, in 1936 to 1939, and it was they who capitulated, ordering the cessation of resistance by the French Army, when by a veritable conspiracy they had managed to force the French Government to resign in June, 1940. From that time onwards Petain and his two principal assistants, Admiral Darlan and Pierre Laval, did their utmost to transform the section of France over which the Germans permitted them to rule into a vassal of Hitlerite Germany. They robbed the country, sending huge quantities of produce, raw materials and machinery to Germany; they swept away all traces of democracy, suppressing working-class organisations, handing over progressive Frenchmen and anti-Fascist foreigners alike to the Germans to be shot, and introducing anti-semitic laws and pogroms on French soil.

It must not be forgotten, above all, that everything which the Vichy Government did, it did as the agent of the Germans by whose good grace it existed at all. The ease with which it was simply brushed aside, on November 8 and the few following days, when Hitler retorted to the Anglo-American landings in North Africa by sending his troops down to the French shores of the Mediterranean, was a convincing demonstration of the unreality of the Vichy regime, except as an agent of the Germans.

Against this machinery of treachery and abject servility to the foreign invader, all sections of the French groups of resistance, whether bourgeois or peasant or worker, whether Communist or Socialist or Radical or Conservative, saw one bright spot on the horizon, outside their country, but linked to it in spirit, as an integral part of the great Anglo-Soviet-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

American coalition fighting Nazi Germany—the Fighting French Forces, headed by de Gaulle. Of course, there might be many who remember the reactionary associations of this or that military leader or politician associated with those forces. But what importance could be attached to political labels or past statements, in comparison with the tremendous fact that here was a body of Frenchmen in arms against the enemies of the French people? Reactionary activities in the past had no significance in comparison with organising or effecting the killing of Nazis in the present. This was the simple basis on which the Fighting French had been accepted as associates of the freedom-loving nations: it was the basis upon which the Soviet Union itself had recognised Fighting France, in an Agreement dated September 28, 1942, as "the French citizens and territories who do not accept capitulation and who, by all the means at their disposal, contribute wherever they are to the liberation of France by the common victory of the Allies over Hitlerite Germany and all its accomplices in Europe."

General de Gaulle might yet have a long way to go in meeting the wishes of the French working class in his statements of policy. Some of his associates might still be moved by the meanest considerations of party advantage—for example, his Commissioner for the Interior, M. André Philip, who could find nothing more intelligent to say at Ottawa, on November 16, than that American support of Darlan "would destroy the whole resistance movement and hand France over to the Communists." Some of his military subordinates might be ex-members of the Fascist "Fiery Cross" and actual monarchists. But none of these considerations could detract from the fact that it was the Fighting French Forces who had played their part in Syria, in Egypt and in Libya, as troops of the United Nations against Hitlerite barbarism.

When the Allied forces landed in North Africa, while the victorious blows of the Eighth Army in Egypt and Libya were still reverberating across the desert, it was naturally to the consistent anti-Hitler French forces that the French people looked as their military leaders. There could be nothing surprising in the fact that this or that lackey of the Germans might decide that the balance of forces had changed in favour of the Allies, and therefore that the time had come to desert Petain. Admiral Darlan might do it to-day; the former Premier Flandin or some other associate of Mr. Neville Chamberlain, in the betrayal of Europe to the Nazis during the years 1934 to 1939, might do it to-morrow; maybe even Laval himself might turn a cat-in-pan the day after, if the Germans were on the run, and seek a new job as a supporter of property, law and order with the Allies. But it was with indignation that the whole world—outside the agents or dupes of Hitlerism—learned of the installation of Darlan, who himself claimed the authority of Marshal Petain for his actions, as head of the administration of liberated North Africa under the Allied forces. It was only a pendant to this that the Fighting French headquarters learned of the actual landings in Africa from the *radio!*

The responsibility for this outrage to the interests and the feelings of freedom-loving peoples cannot yet be fully placed. Certainly the direct responsibility falls on the United States Government. At this point it is worth underlining the ridiculousness of trying to make it appear that the decision was a local one, taken on the spur of the moment and in view of a particular local situation as he found it, by General Eisenhower, the Allied Commander-in-Chief. On November 10 the *Daily Mail* correspondent in Washington sent a message showing quite clearly that this was a Washington decision. He wrote:—

> With the appointment of the French General Giraud to command French forces in Africa, the Allies have, in the view of Washington observers, taken the most important step since the fall of France towards creating a fully-fledged French Government in exile.
>
> It is pointed out that the United States Government has never officially recognised General de Gaulle's Fighting French movement, although it has accorded it the benefit of lease-lend supplies. The American Government is therefore free to consider the setting up of an entirely new French organisation to govern French territories.
>
> Whether Admiral Darlan, now being entertained by an American general, would later join such an organisation, depends on a number of circumstances which cannot yet be disclosed. It can be stated, however, that the occupation of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

French North Africa by the Allies makes possible the grouping together of a far greater number of high French personalities than was possible before.

The next day the *News Chronicle* correspondent in Washington also noted that General Giraud was beginning to overshadow General de Gaulle, and that:—

Estimates are already beginning to appear of chances that General Giraud might emerge as the rallying point of a movement embracing all anti-Axis French, and that such a movement, if established in North Africa, and headed by a Provisional Government, might be one to which the United States would be prepared to give full recognition.

Sure enough, on Sunday November 15, exactly a week after the first American landings, the correspondent of the *Daily Express* at Algiers was able to cable to his newspaper that "a French Coalition Government, headed by Admiral Darlan, representing all factions in North Africa, has been set up. This has been done with the approval of General Eisenhower."

The logical sequence in the course of events is unmistakable. It goes back to the White House. What the motives of the United States Government could have been is a question still wrapped in obscurity. It is well known, of course, that the American State Department has been just as bitterly hostile to de Gaulle, ever since his movement started, as it has been affectionate of Franco—and indeed, as it has moved heaven and earth to undermine friendship with the U.S.S.R. That the State Department, seeing in military leaders not the spokesmen of peoples, but a convenient means of dominating peoples, might wish to provide itself with a "de Gaulle of its own"—as one cynical American put it—was quite comprehensible. Why President Roosevelt supported this policy is still obscure.

But it must be noted that the British Government cannot escape its measure of responsibility, whatever assurances may be given publicly and privately to the contrary. It is well known that relations with General de Gaulle himself have not been of the happiest. In a sense, that may be welcomed: since it drove de Gaulle gradually to realise that, in default of reliable support from Whitehall, he must appeal more and more to democratic sentiment in France itself, and must also take up a more friendly attitude to the Soviet Union than distinguished his earliest utterances after the Hitlerite attack on the U.S.S.R. In both of these directions the General has made notable advances towards a more progressive platform, although, as previously remarked, he has not covered all the ground yet. But it remains a deplorable fact that the constant reports of friction in London were bound to encourage the agents of Vichy—and therefore the State Department as well.

Again, it is noteworthy that on the morning of Monday, November 16, that is, when the sensational announcement about the Darlan "Government" was already twenty-four hours old—the *News-Chronicle* published a statement by its diplomatic correspondent which was obviously the fruit of talks with Foreign Office officials the night before, and which endeavoured without hesitation to throttle any criticism of the appointment of Darlan. When it is borne in mind that the newspaper reports from Washington, quoted earlier, had already been public property for several days, that they must have represented only a fraction of the information about Washington's plans available through various channels in London, and that in addition the British Government had a political representative, Mr. Mack, with General Eisenhower from the very first, the significance of this statement is the more notable.

Diplomatic quarters in London yesterday were still without adequate information on which to form a clear picture of the political situation in French North Africa arising out of the Allied coup. But there was the strongest possible feeling that the present is no time for indulging in political speculation or factional partisanship which might prejudice the rapid and successful conclusion of the job in hand. . . .

It is of direct military benefit to the Allied Force to secure the maximum possible co-operation from the French and native military forces and civil population in North Africa, so that it can accomplish its task with the minimum of distraction or diversion of effort.

It is these considerations which must weigh most heavily with the Allied commanders in the field. If in the haste of military action, political mistakes are made, these can be rectified when the dust of battle settles. But military mistakes cannot be repaired. Military considerations must come before those of personalities or politics for the time being.

What political decisions have to be made, to ensure the successful accomplishment of the military task, must be left for the time being to the Allied commanders on the spot. For these

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

reasons, official quarters in London yesterday were strongly deprecating any premature discussion or criticism of these decisions, or any efforts to bring partisan political pressure to bear in favour of or against individual personalities or factions.

In plain English, this meant that the Foreign Office circles which inspired this statement considered that it might be of direct military benefit to appoint Darlan head of a "Government" in North Africa; that this had been a decision taken purely on the spot by the military commander: and that any criticism of this step was "factional partisanship" and "premature."

In any case, the Fighting French Headquarters were not terrorised into silence. Echoing the feelings of the French people, and the vast mass of British and American opinion—as well as of the other Allies, who might well ask: "If de Gaulle is to be thrown over to propitiate Darlan, may not we be sacrificed in our turn for some Quisling, when the time comes?"—Fighting French Headquarters that same night (November 16) issued a stinging comment:

General de Gaulle and the French National Committee announce that they are taking no part whatsoever in, and assume no responsibility for, the negotiations in progress in Northern Africa with the representatives of Vichy. Should the negotiations result in arrangements which would in effect confirm the Vichy regime in North Africa, such positions could obviously not be accepted by Fighting France. The union of all French territory overseas and the struggle for liberation should be achieved in conditions consonant with the will and dignity of the French people.

This clear and sharply pointed statement left no room for doubt. Mr. Roosevelt issued his reassuring statement within twenty-four hours. He put the responsibility for the "political arrangements made for the time being" on General Eisenhower: we have seen how far this is justified. He said there would be no recognition or reconstitution of the Vichy Government, and that no one in the United States Army has any authority to discuss the future Government of France. He repeated again and again that the arrangements were purely temporary; although he did not explain, even so, why it was necessary to proclaim Darlan the head of a Government. Nine days too late, President Roosevelt announced that he had "requested the liberation of all persons in North Africa who had been imprisoned because they opposed the efforts of the Axis to dominate the world, and for the abrogation of all laws and decrees inspired by Nazi governments or Nazi ideologists."

There the matter stands, at the time of writing. It has yet to be seen whether Darlan and his creatures, in view of the open demonstration of support given to them quite unnecessarily, will really fulfil the rôle for which they are cast by the Allied Governments, and will even carry into effect the pledges asked for by President Roosevelt. As the Red Army has in a series of new victories inflicted immense losses on the enemy, Britain and the United States have an immense opportunity, both in Africa and in Europe. The French people are ready and anxious to join in the fight, and facilitate the tasks of the American and British armies. Innumerable acts of resistance continue and extend all over French territory. It is not without significance that the latest messages from France speak of redoubled activity by the heroic French Communist Party, recognised even by its political opponents in the de Gaulle camp to be leading the working class (and therefore the whole nation) in united resistance under the banner of Fighting France.

"I received word only this morning that resistance in France has been increased as a result of the victory at Stalingrad. In France the people no longer read the official journals; but by listening to broadcasts from Britain, Russia and America they have a clear idea of the development of the war. Political parties still exist in France. In some parts the Socialist and Communist parties have gained much support, but on the question of resistance we are all united as Gaullists and work together." These words of a Socialist Deputy, Pierre Bloch, fresh from a concentration camp in which he was imprisoned with Communists and British officers, speak the mind of the French people. Whatever the intrigues in London, Algiers or Washington, the French people have moved back into the fighting coalition of freedom-loving nations to smash Hitler: and neither Darlans nor Lavals will hold them back.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Stiffen the Sinews

by WILLIAM RUST

IN the course of his speech on the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Soviet Revolution Stalin spoke on the relation of the rear to the front and the vast, peaceful, constructive work that had taken place. "The people themselves in the rear have been transformed," he said, "they have become more efficient, less slipshod, more disciplined: they have learned to work in wartime fashion and have come to realise their duty to the motherland and her defenders at the front—to the Red Army."

In these precise and practical words Stalin pointed to one of the greatest achievements of the Soviet State and again emphasised the rôle of the people and his deep concern for them. Behind these conclusions there is a moving story of heroic achievement and sacrifice.

No state can gain lasting military victories unless its forces in the field are sustained by the high morale and intense labours of the people in the rear. Consequently all belligerents are compelled to devote attention to the strengthening of the rear; the raising of morale and the increasing of production. The German collapse in the last war, it will be remembered, came with lightning suddenness following upon the break-up of the rear.

From the very beginning of the Hitler attack the Soviet people displayed a unity of purpose and power of resistance such as the world has never seen before. But there was still a certain tolerance of the enemy and an unwillingness to believe that Fascism had turned such large numbers of Germans into human monsters, who had to be mercilessly fought and destroyed. As the war followed its bloody course and as the Soviet people were subjected to fearful and gruesome atrocities, so did they express in all their activities a passionate hatred of the enemy. The noble sentiment of hatred for Fascism fired the whole of the Soviet people.

A burning, fierce hatred of the enemy is the essential of a high, fighting morale in this patriotic war against Fascism. And this applies no less to Britain than to the Soviet Union.

Can we say that the whole of the British people are consumed with the same hatred for the enemy? Is our morale powerful enough to withstand the heavy blows that the enemy may yet direct against us?

That the war has changed the people is unquestioned. Experience has been a profound teacher. In the armed forces the younger generation has learned a new comradeship and spirit of self-reliance, many insular prejudices have been broken down, the workers have gained greater confidence in themselves and the women have come to the forefront of the war effort. Life has become harder, sacrifices are many, but life has a purpose that it did not previously possess. And now that offensive action is at last opening out there is a visible quickening of mass interest and activity.

But it would be idle to draw merely a rosy picture of the state of morale in Britain to-day when there are so many marked weaknesses which have yet to be overcome. There still exists not a small measure of passivity, indifference, heedlessness which has yet to be burned out by the fires of hatred against Fascism. There still exists a flabbiness in the war effort which has got to be overcome if the country is to achieve full mobilisation and if all the wiles of the enemy are to be frustrated.

The foulness of Fascism and the mercilessness of the fight against the enemy is not yet fully understood by the British people and its leaders. The proof of this is the extraordinary liberality which is still displayed despite the fact that the fate of the nation depends upon the ruthless crushing of the enemy.

When a particularly notorious Nazi general is captured the old school tie standard of friendly wars comes uppermost. British prisoners are in chains, but the captured Nazi is invited to dinner and his hand is shaken by the victor. The general is then brought to London and met at the railway station by high ranking officers. Most amazing of all is that the official propaganda machine sets to work to accord the widest possible publicity to

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

each separate incident. Unfortunately, this is not accidental. No news or photos are released in these days without care and decision on the part of the Ministry of Propaganda and the censorship. None of the higher-ups in the Ministry of Information appear to think that the publication of such goings on can be damaging to public morale.

A Cabinet Minister's son goes to Berlin to broadcast vile, treacherous stuff against his own country. His father expresses surprise, but does not consider it incumbent upon him to issue a repudiation and denunciation. Is it possible to conceive that the Soviet public would tolerate such paternal discretion on the part of a Soviet statesman if he were so unfortunate as to be cursed with a quisling son?

This is, indeed, business as usual so far as morale is concerned. What does it all matter? Let us go on ambling our own sweet way. Why criticise the foibles of General Montgomery or interfere with the private life of Mr. Amery? Such arguments betray a peace-time stillness and a remoteness from that spirit which Shakespeare conjured up when Henry V addressed his troops before Honfleur:

But when the blast of war blows in our ears,
Then imitate the action of the tiger;
Stiffen the sinews, summon up the blood,
Disguise fair nature with hard-favour'd rage;
Then lend the eye a terrible aspect;
Let it pry through the portage of the head
Like the brass cannon; let the brow o'erwhelm it
As fearfully as doth a galled rock
O'erhang and jutty his confounded base,
Swilled with the wild and wasteful ocean.

Public reaction to the Soviet demand that the war criminal Hess should be placed on trial also provided an interesting pointer to the state of morale, and revealed that even the Left is not immune from that flabbiness which plays directly into the hands of the reactionaries and pro-Fascist elements. For various reasons the Government sought to sidetrack the issue of the Hess trial, although it is clear that this trial would have been a powerful means of strengthening anti-Fascist feeling in Britain and of demonstrating in a most dramatic manner the crimes and iniquities for which the Nazis must be called to account.

But it must be admitted that those who wished to avoid the Hess trial had little difficulty. What public demand existed for this action was easily smothered with the argument that it would provoke retaliatory measures against British prisoners. This argument was even accepted by workers who were engaged at the time in the vigorous advocacy of the Second Front. Could such workers, who shrink from the atrocities which might follow a Hess trial, really be firm in their advocacy of a military action which inevitably involves countless sacrifices?

The Nazis have already chained a number of British prisoners. They have starved, tortured and murdered tens of thousands of Red Army men. It is quite certain that as the war becomes more desperate and bloody and as the situation of the German armies becomes more desperate, that the Nazis will attempt to kill, rape, loot and torture on an even greater scale. The British people will never be able to save themselves or to save British prisoners from the horrors of Nazidom by the mollycoddling of Hitler's deputy. It is disturbing to find that such an illusion is so widely cherished, that a fierce hatred for Fascism does not yet consume our people. It is inconceivable that such a state of affairs could exist in the Soviet Union, that a leading Nazi gangster could fall into Soviet hands without being speedily brought to trial.

How can the British people expect the French, Norwegians, Jugoslavs and others to resist the Nazis at the risk of slaughter to innocent hostages among their people if in Britain we fear to act against Nazi No. 2 for fear of what the Hitler gang might do in retaliation?

Although these weaknesses go very deep and constitute a serious problem, it would be basically wrong to suggest that the nation is incapable of fulfilling the tasks that history has placed before it. When called upon to do so, people are capable of rising to great heights of sacrifice and heroic endeavour as it already proved by the valour of the soldiers in the field and the stoicism of the civilian population in face of the heavy blitzes. But the weakness is there and it would be folly to ignore it.

The solution is to be found in the strengthening of national unity and the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

resolute rooting out of those influences which deliberately seek to foster an outlook favourable to the doing of a deal with the Nazis. It is precisely the would-be appeasers and quislings who are fearful of the wrath of the people, which is the greatest barrier to intrigues aimed at preventing the waging of the war to a triumphant conclusion.

The historical cause of the present weaknesses in national morale is to be found in the class system, just as the inspiring national and moral unity of the Soviet people arises from the monolithic character of the new society. It is, of course, not possible to carry through basic social changes during the course of a great patriotic war and when the outcome of urgent and vital military operations depend upon the virility of national unity. But it is possible to curb class excesses, to end many of the inequalities of sacrifice, to proclaim democratic war aims and to wage a virile anti-Fascist propaganda calculated to stir and enthuse the masses. That is why the new phase in the military conduct of the war must be paralleled by a new phase on the home front. Britain possesses the men, the generals and the statesman able to lead the country to victory, but the talents of the people must be fully utilised, the Government and the General Staff must be strengthened by the elimination of all incompetents and unreliables.

No greater blunder could be made than to suppose that because the North Africa fighting has gone so decisively in favour of the Allies that now is the time for general rejoicing and relaxation. On the contrary, these initial successes must be utilised to stiffen the fighting spirit in preparation for the far heavier tasks that have yet to be fulfilled before the ruthless powerful and cunning enemy is finally crushed. Certainly, the pessimism and inferiority spirit engendered by years of depressing failures must now be wiped out once and for all. But easy going optimism can hold dangers as great as gloom and pessimism.

Pernicious intrigues can flourish behind facile boasting. The productive effort can flag (remember the acute unsolved problem of coal production and the deep-rooted resistance to the sacrifice that rationing would mean) at a moment when the greatest effort is required. The enemy, who is working feverishly to turn conquered Europe into a Fascist fortress, can gain at our expense unless the *speed* of our war effort surpasses his own.

It is the task of the Government and of the political parties to inflame the fighting spirit and to raise the morale of the people at this turning point of the war so that not a moment is lost. And this cannot be achieved unless the people are imbued with a remorseless hatred of the Fascist enemy and are determined to strike down every person who speaks or fights for Fascism, or acts on its behalf.

BOUND VOLUMES 1942

Bound Volumes for 1942 will be put in hand immediately. Many readers were unable to secure Bound Volumes for 1941 through not applying in time. Only a strictly limited number of copies will be available. Prices are as follows :—

Bound Volume, 1942, in handsome dark blue binding, with gold lettering ... ... 11s. 0d.

Bound Volume, 1942, in Part Exchange for at least 10 loose copies... ... ... 7s. 6d.

The above prices include postage.
We must ask readers to let us have their orders, remittances and loose copies (in good condition, fit for binding) immediately they have finished reading the December issue. Orders will be treated in strict priority.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Indian Deadlock

by K. S. SHELVANKAR

ON November 1 the Government of India announced that the ban on the publication of unofficial reports of disturbances had been lifted all over India. In the absence of other news, we are entitled to infer from this that the disorders which followed the arrest of the Congress leaders and continued sporadically for some weeks, have now greatly diminished in frequency, if they have not altogether ceased. Production, too, has returned to normal except in Ahmedabad, the textile centre, and Gandhian stronghold, where all the mills are still idle.* In organising disciplined protest against repression, as well as in helping to maintain output, the Communist Party of India has played a leading role.

Although India appears again to be relatively calm on the surface, the tension and the causes that led to the recent outbreaks are still there; the political issue, with all its grave implications, still calls urgently for settlement. An important development during the last few months has been the growth of American anxiety over the situation. Both Sir Stafford Cripps and Mr. Amery—not to mention Lord Halifax—have endeavoured by means of special broadcasts and articles to dispel this feeling and inspire confidence in the Government's handling of the problem, but their efforts do not seem to have had much success.

According to Bertrand Russell, the "excitement" that exists in the United States over the Indian deadlock is hardly realised over here. An almost continuous discussion goes on, both in the press and on the wireless. Some of the foremost representatives of American opinion—politicians, church leaders, journalists, radio commentators, writers and others—have expressed their views, and the great majority of them are deeply disturbed by the policy which has resulted in alienating the Indian masses and locking-up their leaders. Mr. Wendell Willkie has now publicly joined the critics, and in his powerful broadcast of October 26 he brought out the fact that India has become the "symbol," the touchstone throughout Asia and Eastern Europe of the sincerity of Anglo-American protestations.

One result of this criticism has been to prevent any relaxation of British interest in India. It has come to be a factor, and a very considerable factor, in Anglo-American relations. Many who would otherwise have remained indifferent or accepted the official attitude without question are now inclined to challenge it and admit the need for a fresh start. Over the country as a whole, while there is still much ignorance, and more misunderstanding, artificially fostered, of the facts of the case, there is also a conviction that it is high time to move the Government out of the obstinately negative position that it has taken up.

This was clearly reflected in the Parliamentary debates of October, and in the press comments on them. Most of those who took part in the debates pointed out that the "restoration of order," or repression, was in itself no policy, and they either put forward their own proposals for ending the stalemate or urged the Government to seek out ways of doing so. But none of the ministerial spokesmen showed any willingness to respond to these appeals. They seemed to be irritated and perturbed by the hostility which their policy has aroused not only in Britain but in the United States and China, and they retracted under pressure the utterly unfounded allegations that had previously been made concerning Axis influence in the Indian National Movement, but they adhered rigidly to the substance of the policy outlined in the Prime Minister's notorious statement of September 9.*

Public discussion has chiefly centred on two questions: first, the mechanics of breaking the deadlock, and secondly, the actual terms of settlement. On the first question, the proposal that the United Nations should be invited to mediate has met with a wide response, particularly in

* Since this was written, these mills also have mostly resumed work.

* The speeches of Mr. Amery and Lord Simon caused intense indignation in India, even among members of the Viceroy's Executive Council. Six out of the eleven Indian members are reported to have sent a joint telegram of protest to the Viceroy.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

America. Different views have been expressed as to the exact scope, object and method of such mediation, but the broad suggestion that the Soviet Union,* China and the United States—and especially President Roosevelt *in person—should take the initiative* in promoting a settlement is supported by many influential individuals and newspapers in America) including the Scripps-Howard publications and the *Washington Post*, which is believed to be in close touch with the Administration) and by the C.I.O. and also the Canadian Co-operative Confederation. It has been received with less enthusiasm in this country, but is not without its champions in Liberal and Church circles.

The suggestion has at least the advantage of emphasising that India is not Britain's private problem : that is why it provokes alarm and resentment in quarters where India is still regarded as an imperial estate, as a British possession. Obviously, however, third party intervention cannot materialise or lead to any satisfactory result without the consent and co-operation of the British Government. It is possible that the American and Chinese Governments have already taken some steps in the matter, but whatever role they may play, whatever the degree of influence they may be prepared and able to exert on the British Government, the responsibility for ensuring that there is a change of policy in the right direction rests primarily with the British people. The appeal to the United Nations cannot absolve them from it.

As regards the terms of settlement, a number of suggestions have been made, both here and in India. They are all designed, at least ostensibly, to bring about a real and immediate transfer of power, and to give effect, in varying degree, to the idea of a national Government. Mr. Vernon Bartlett's plan is essentially a development of the Cripps proposals ; it provides, among other things, for a fully Indianised Executive Council, and a gentlemen's agreement whereby the Viceroy would bind himself not to over-ride his Council except in matters of Defence and Foreign Affairs. Mr. Rajagopalachari's plan, which aims at the creation of an interim Coalition Government responsible to a newly-elected legislature, approximates more closely to the Congress demand. Some of the suggestions have received a very wide measure of support among all groups and parties in India, but it is not very profitable to examine them in detail, as they all suffer from the fatal drawback of attempting to achieve a settlement in disregard of the Congress leaders who command the largest mass following in the country. Without releasing them, and opening negotiations with them, no settlement is conceivable.

The attack on the Congress, and its leaders, has not disintegrated the national movement. It has only helped to bring closer to one another, and at the same time closer to the fundamental Congress position, many of those groups which had formerly stood apart from the Congress. The action of Mr. Allah Baksh, lately premier of Sind, who renounced his titles as a protest against British policy, gives a clue to the state of feeling among independent Moslems. Even within the Moslem League there is a definite and growing tendency on the part of the younger members to press for a *rapprochement* with the Congress. However, in spite of the existing unity behind the demand for a national Government, Delhi, we are told by the *Manchester Guardian's* Correspondent in India, " is not anxious for a large scale change in the next six months."

The obstacle to a settlement now does not lie in "Indian disagreements"—it lies with the Government, which still looks upon the Indian people as a hostile force to be "contained" and kept in check for the duration of the war. By persisting in this attitude it has isolated itself from progressive opinion in every part of the world. But it can only be compelled to abandon it and revise its policy and bring India into a timely and fruitful alliance with the United Nations if the Labour and Democratic movement in this country exerts its strength more actively than it has done so far.

November 10, 1942.

* It is worth recording here that relations between the Soviet Union and India are developing, as testified by the unofficial goodwill mission now reported to be on its way to Moscow, and the projected exchange of labour delegations between the two countries.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The New Christian Socialism

by Rev. F. H. AMPHLETT MICKLEWRIGHT, M.A.

[On a topic now arousing controversy we are pleased to print this Article.—ED: L.M.]

THE phrase "Christian Socialism" has a lengthy history in English political thought. From 1848 until 1854 it was the slogan of a group headed by F. D. Maurice and Charles Kingsley. This body of clergy, troubled about social conditions and shaken by the Chartist upheaval and the abortive revolutionary movement of 1848, sought to propagate progressive reform and anti-revolution at the same time. Since that period there has always been a thin trickle of Christian Socialists within the churches. Some have been more advanced than others; Stewart Headlam was inspired by Henry George and founded his Guild of St. Matthew in 1877 as an avowedly Socialistic society. In this century Conrad Noel sought to propagate a species of "Christian Communism" which set out to capture the Church for revolutionary ardour: but it never got very far and its founder lapsed into "leftism" during his last years. A certain number of clergy became Fabian reformers and aimed at a few social ameliorations within the capitalist system. For the most part they were faced with various opponents. The working classes were either indifferent or hostile, whilst the Church of England as a body played its part as a solidly Tory corporation.

Viewed from the perspective of the working-class movement as a whole, Christian Socialism has failed to achieve sound results. It retained too much of an outworn theology which science has done a great deal to overthrow; its authority has never been anything stronger than a subjective and emotional reaction to a picture shaped from New Testament texts. Meanwhile, the official Church has remained the avowed guardian of a capitalist society, providing it with a moral veneer. In 1936 friendly relations were achieved between the Church of England and that of Finland, in spite of mutually opposing views of ecclesiastical order. Opposition on "theological" issues was silenced at the behest of the Foreign Office; the subsequent history of Finland goes far to provide the reason! The late Archbishop of Canterbury did little more than to follow the Government in his moral attitude; he was a strict non-interventionist during the Spanish war. A few so-called Socialistic Reformers received ecclesiastical preferment, but when the Dean of Canterbury outlined a masterly and scientific approach to the subject, pulpits re-echoed with denunciation.

The whole subject is not without importance at the moment, for Dr. Temple, now Archbishop of Canterbury, now seeks to awaken the Church to a sense of social responsibility. The report of his conference, held at Malvern in January, 1941, shows him determined to seek a moral leadership within the nation. At the Albert Hall meeting on September 26, 1942, following upon the Malvern conference. Dr. Temple was supported by Dr. Garbett, the Archbishop of York, and Sir Stafford Cripps, member of the War Cabinet. This impressive platform received considerable press notice. The Archbishop was rebuked by ultra-reactionaries of the type of Sir Ernest Benn, the upholder of a decadent *laissez faire* individualism and by the extreme Tories. But, in the main, the press was favourable and there are certain signs that this movement is under way.

The ground has been prepared for its coming. Various groups have issued literature urging the claim of the Church to decide upon the morality of prevailing economic and political structures. *The Sword of the Spirit Movement*, sponsored in the first place by Roman Catholics, has proclaimed a form of social ordering which could only be achieved under a semi-ecclesiastical dictatorship, and towards this movement Dr. Temple has shown much friendliness. In liberalised Protestant circles, the writings of Reinhold Niebuhr have promoted a superficial "leftness" which is both anti-Marxist and irrationalist: it has an autocratic theology of a neo-Calvinistic type. It would be a mistake to ignore Dr. Temple's movement, which has behind it the prestige of the official Church and is likely to consolidate a vague reformism, antipathetic to social revolution and anxious to work within the existing order of society. Although unlikely to supplant

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the working-class movement, it could act as a disruptive force within it.

The archiepiscopal economics are summed up in a small pamphlet, *Malvern and After*. Five separate issues are passed in review. Certain intolerable results occur as the outcome of competition: the profit-motive is misdirected and abused: Labour does not participate in the control of production: far-reaching changes are needed in the system of land-ownership: the "credit" system arising from the use of money in the present order needs readjustment. Action upon these issues would lead to a non-violent Christian revolution by setting up an order of society which stands nearer to the Christian view of man as an end in himself of final and eternal worth. The statement contains good things—as far as it goes! Every one of the issues represents obvious abuses existing within the system of private monopoly capitalism. Each heading summarises a question to which Marxists have given close attention. But the important issues must lie with the solutions and remedies proposed at Malvern and reasserted by Dr. Temple at the Albert Hall.

There is nothing in the pamphlet incompatible with mild reformism. The capitalist era has reached the stage of its decline. Two immediate courses are open. The one, accepted by Marxists, presupposes social revolution followed by the building up of a Communist society. The other is an attempt at a reform which leaves untouched the essential framework of capitalist society. The old system is to be kept intact; certain rough edges are to be pared away, life is to be made more tolerable for the wage-earning classes, but ultimate economic control is prevented from passing into communal hands. The use of the term "revolution" in this connection is as ingenuous as is the setting forth of the method as the sharp alternative to "violent revolution." Without specific reference, the implication is that Marxists and scientific Socialists are "men of violence." Dr. Temple must know more history than this statement implies! Both in France, in 1871, in Russia in 1918-20 and in Spain in 1936, the real bloodshed was due to the violent activities of the counter-revolutionaries. During a social upheaval, the episcopal semi-pacifism would prove impracticable as a policy. His fellow-worker in the *Sword of the Spirit Movement*, Cardinal Hinsley, could possibly tell him a great deal of the activity of the counter-revolutionaries in Spain and the methods which they employed. This exposes the falsity of the Malvern antithesis.

The real weakness of the proposals lies in the extent to which "control" is substituted for communal ownership. They do not grapple with the vital question of the final holding of economic power. "Private and company enterprise" is still to be allowed a vital part in the management of industry. The profit motive must not be abused or misdirected, but it is permitted to remain as a thing in itself. However much methods of reform may evoke temporary expedients for material comfort, they do not strike at the heart of the problem. It is instructive to turn from Dr. Temple to the volumes of the Webbs and to recall that the Soviet system is only possible because it rests upon a communal ownership of land, basic factories, and banks. The private profit motive is a discordant element; land necessitates a more drastic treatment than that of "control in its use." Industry, if it is to serve the community, demands communal ownership rather than some scheme of a vague participation in its management by the workpeople.

The Report has a more dangerous side. It coincides with the archiepiscopal attempt to gain ecclesiastical control over the State-aided schools in post-war educational replanning. Even though the Church of England does not press the time-worn tag, "outside the Church, no salvation," it has not been a tolerant body. Its theology is erected upon narrowly orthodox premises; its social outlook has made historically for things as they are. Even the Malvern Report fails to realise the degree to which internationalism is implicit in a Socialist philosophy; a few days later, after speaking at the Albert Hall in support of a progressive housing policy, the Archbishop of York delivered a speech in the House of Lords supporting the governmental maintenance of a deadlock in India. It would not be difficult to engineer a position in which the Church and State come to some terms of close agreement concerning working policy, a veneer of reformism is applied, and a practical dictatorship set up. The

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

prospects for civil liberty would not then be bright, whilst the ecclesiastical body would prove a strong barrier to social movements springing out of the inherent nature of the capitalist crisis.

It is not difficult to understand what has happened. The Church has been, historically, little more than the State on its moral side since the conversion of the Emperor Constantine in A.D. 325. It has sanctified each social structure as it has arisen—feudalism, mercantilism, industrialism, trustification. The stresses of the last few years have led to various crises within capitalism; an economic and social adjustment is needed if revolution is to be bought off once again as it was in 1848. The Church has stepped forward to play its part by moralising upon contemporary social reformism; it has prepared the way for certain ameliorative measures which only serve to hide the intensely predatory nature of the present social order. Whilst leaving the fundamental issues unchallenged, it seeks to aid the possessing classes by pretending that a thorough social revolution has taken place. Church history is one of the more interesting strands of human activity when it is read from an angle of economic interpretation and in the light of materialist conceptions. At each stage of their history the large official churches have their true foundations in the needs of the possessing classes; the theological moralisings are a mere cover for underlying economic and political motives. The opposition which Dr. Temple has encountered from Sir Ernest Benn and a few ultra-Tories is insignificant; the general official policy of capitalist reconstruction is with him in his crusade.

The movement sponsored by the Archbishop of Canterbury is therefore both a further example of the sentimental economic reformism which has usually accepted the label of Christian Socialism and a deliberate attempt to utilise religion as a support for capitalist reconstruction. Its acceptance of such terms as "revolution" is adroit; it may entangle a certain number and direct their efforts away from the real issues of the class-struggle. Its ultimate end is a quasi-ecclesiastical dictatorship with all that history teaches concerning churches which have accepted a position of this kind.

The answer to it lies in the Marxist analysis of life and of history. However well-meaning Dr. Temple may be, economic reformism is essentially reactionary in practice. The dialectics of history point out a very different road as leading to the evolution of the classless society. Capitalism has now reached its final crisis; the contemporary ecclesiastical movement so far is no more than an attempt to use theological conceptions and morals in order to postpone its final collapse.

But in so far as it may lead to a wide awakening of Church members to the new world issues, it provides opportunities for discussion and a stirring of political thought. There may be many who, once aroused, can pass beyond the archiepiscopal limits and, like Piers Plowman, look on from Malvern upon the realities of life in Britain and see the need for a transformation. They will be welcome, both in the National United Front of to-day in the struggle for victory over Fascism: and afterwards in the movement of the peoples that can reshape the world.

Egidio Gennari

[Egidio Gennari died last April in Tiflis in the Soviet Union.]

BORN sixty-six years ago from a family of Emilian peasants who at great sacrifices to themselves worked to give him a university education, Egidio Gennari at the age of twenty joined the Italian Socialist Party. These were the tumultuous years of the first war of Italian imperialism to conquer Abyssinia, when the Italian proletariat found allies in the more progressive section of the lower and middle bourgeoisie in the fight against reaction and the imperialist war, against those who foreswore the Risorgimento and the tradition of Garibaldi. But Gennari, differing from the leaders of the Socialist Party at that time—Turati, Treves, Bissolati, etc.—insisted from the first that the proletariat must be the vanguard, not the rearguard of the movement.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Later Egidio Gennari, in the popular resistance against the war of 1911 for the conquest of Libya, fought the group who "had put Karl Marx in the attic," and renounced the position as vanguard of the working class for a mess of pottage. In the defeat of the reformists at the Congress of Reggio Emilia in 1912—an event of exceptional importance in the history of the workers' movement of Italy—Gennari participated with all his energy.

In 1914-18 reaction was increasing in strength: thousands of Italian Socialists, amongst them Lazzari and Serrati, were in gaol. The old reformist leaders were trying once again to bring the Socialist Party and the working-class into collaboration with the bourgeois Imperialists. It was then that Egidio Gennari took over, along with Antonio Gramsci and a few others, the direction of the group that stood for the standpoint and leadership of Lenin.

As a follower of Lenin, Gennari was elected head of the Socialist Party immediately after the world war. The error committed by Gennari in this period was that he did not fight against reformism and centralism in an organised manner. As leader of the Socialist party, Egidio Gennari, during 1919-20, led the mass movement which opposed imperialist intervention against the young Soviet Republic. These actions in defence of the young Soviet Republic alone would be enough to endear his name to the workers not only of Italy, but of the whole world. But when it was evident that many of the leaders of the Socialist party and the General Confederation of Labour were only voicing their sympathy for the October Revolution and using bolshevised language to mislead and put a brake on the masses, Gennari, a sincere and profound revolutionary, broke with them.

Then arrived the Fascist offensive, the bestial terror, aggressions, devastations, arson and assassinations. Gennari, then deputy for the workers of Trieste, was dangerously wounded by a dagger, a treacherous thrust by the orders of Mussolini and Co. The situation worsened from year to year, from month to month. To retain his power Mussolini had recourse to still more brutal terror. Gennari was obliged, by reaction and an order of the party, to leave Italy.

After that, many long and sad years of ferocious reaction, illegal work with small results, of hard blows against our organisation inside the country. But Gennari, calm, serene, and full of faith, continued his work, a responsible Communist in the various jobs assigned to him by his party and by the International. At his post, fighting the leftists who so thinly hid their treachery and compromise with Fascism, against the shameful opportunism of Angelo Tasca (Serra-Leroux) who later on, after the defeat of France fell himself into the arms of Fascism, against the ignoble group Santini-Blasco-Leonetti, who rapidly fell into the quagmire of Trotskyist counter-revolutionism; he was at the front of the fight in the defence of Leninism and the policy of Stalin, against all the enemies of the party whatever their colour, mask, or jargon.

His articles and pamphlets on the Italian situation and the duties of the party—result of profound and serious study—were over a period of years a contribution of great importance and help to hundreds and thousands of comrades. His speech, affectionate, fraternal, and convincing, was listened to with respect and attention by militant exiles and great masses of emigrant Italian workers on whose minds he made a profound and lasting impression.

Alas! Comrade Gennari will not return to Italy, will not speak to the workers and peasants and the intellectuals of Italy! He will never see our country again! But it is a great comfort to know that he died on Soviet soil, in the land of all the workers, in the country that Gennari so dearly loved and for which he would have given his life without a thought. And it is a comfort to know from our comrades in Moscow: "The name of Gennari will be an inspiration to the workers and all Italians, pushing them to a fight without quarter for the overthrow of Fascist tyranny, to restore civil liberty crushed by Fascism, to win for Italy her place amongst free civilised nations."

(Abridged from *Stato Operaio.*)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mr. H. G. Wells and Communism

by THE EDITOR

IN the November issue of the LABOUR MONTHLY, which was devoted to the commemoration of the Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the Soviet Union, and to tributes to the achievement of the Soviet Union by representative personalities, Mr. H. G. Wells was among those invited to contribute. He responded with a contribution which was in fact mainly devoted to the special polemical controversy which he has long pursued against Marxism, Communism and the Communist Party. Such a polemical controversy, with the inevitable answer to which it would give rise, could on any other occasion have served a purpose for clearing up certain issues. But to choose the occasion of a united tribute from spokesmen of this country to our ally in order to air domestic squabbles would have been a disservice and shown a lack of sense of proportion. Accordingly, we held over Mr. Wells' contribution from the November issue, and now print it below, together with some comment on the issues he raises.

Mr. Wells wrote:—

13, Hanover Terrace,
Regent's Park, N.W.1.
Oct. 5, 1942.

R. Palme Dutt, Esq.,
Editor,
LABOUR MONTHLY.

Dear Mr. Dutt,

I doubt if I can write you quite the article you would like me to do. The Russian Revolution was a great event in the march of mankind towards an equalitarian federated world socialism, as great, or greater than, the French Revolution. But from the first it suffered, as all great stirrings of human life must, from the human limitations of those who had to carry it out. Controversies and rivalries for personal ascendencies arose to dictate, and impose a rigid "party line." Every intelligent and creative spirit who had anything to offer to the making of a new world was yapped at and insulted by these industrious party dictators. At meetings he was met by organised yapping, and the orthodox publications of the party dealt with his heresies in a pose of omniscient disdain. A militant orthodoxy incapable of meeting the rapidly changing opportunities of this period of social dissolution set its face against any further intellectual co-operation of Russia and the Western world. In my talks to Lenin and Stalin I found your party activities had established a veil of misunderstanding between us. Lenin believed that the troubles in Ireland were a revolt of an industrial Proletariat against Capitalism and showed me the *Workers' Dreadnought* as evidence that Ireland was ripe for the social revolution. I did my best to explain that that paper was printed for his consumption by your sort of people, in the interests of your personal self-importance.

It is difficult to over-estimate the mischief the Communist Party has done to mankind in the past third of a century. Its wildly irrational propaganda of extravagant menace has done enormous mischief in discrediting genuine Radical and revolutionary thought in the Atlantic countries. Everywhere reaction has welcomed you and been willing to subsidise your systematic disintegration of progressive movements. So that I welcome your projected November number warmly if it really means, as it seems to do, that you are opening your minds to the real constructive forces of the past third of a century. But if you imagine you are going to find us down on all fours, kotowing to the ineffable and unchangeable wisdom that has hitherto found expression through the LABOUR MONTHLY, then—I have overrated your mental and moral distention.

I welcome your invitation because I have long desired an opportunity of dealing plainly with you personally, and now your demand for this article has delivered you into my hand. I do not see how you can avoid printing it and I do not see how you can evade a reply. And what reply you can make except repentance I cannot imagine.

Sincerely yours,
H. G. WELLS.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mr. Wells' contribution expresses the outlook, perhaps in somewhat extreme form, of those sections of the liberal intellectuals who, while embracing the general humanitarian ideal of Socialism, object to Marxism, to Communist Party organisation and discipline, and to the working class dictatorship as abhorrent to their Liberal principles. In other words, they want the end, but object to the means, and in consequence often finish on the wrong side of the real political struggle.

For many years, in many eloquent writings, Mr. Wells has painted glowing pictures of the future world Socialist society, free from the narrowness of sectional barriers, prejudice, intolerance and superstition, and has thereby deeply influenced and placed in his debt the progressive thought of two generations. He has fought in the forefront of many progressive causes, as recently in his championship of the restoration of the *Daily Worker*. All this must be recognised, and will gladly be recognised, whatever the differences on certain burning immediate issues in the battle for social emancipation.

In his role as critic of existing social disorders and as prophet of the future free Communist society, Mr. Wells has carried forward the tradition of the great Utopians, of a Saint-Simon or Robert Owen. But there is a difference of date. The ingenuousness which was pardonable a century and more ago, before capitalism had reached its full development and before the working class had effectively entered on the political stage, and which in consequence looked to the existing rulers and enlightened personalities to carry out its grandiose schemes of social reconstruction, and was amazed and disappointed to meet only with rebuffs: that *naivete* is less pardonable to-day, after the development of the class struggle and the working-class movement through the nineteenth century, after the theories of Marx and Engels had laid bare the laws of social development, and after the twentieth-century experience of the working-class revolution, of Bolshevism and of the construction of Socialism in the Soviet Union have demonstrated the efficacy of these theories in practice.

Utopianism which has failed to learn these lessons; which remains a century behind the times; which simultaneously admits its complete incapacity to find the way to reach Socialism and yet attacks those who are leading the way to the goal; which attacks the stern necessities of party organisation, of working-class discipline and of the practical struggle in the name of ideal Liberal principles of the future free society whose realisation depends on the victory of Communism: such Utopianism at best condemns its votaries to be helpless and ineffective figures in the political world, and at worst can lead to a directly reactionary role: to venomous abuse of a Lenin at the height of the life-and-death struggle of the Russian Revolution in 1918 and demands for his extirpation along with the Kaiser; to dreams of a "Blue Train" Socialism, and to sniping at the most active fighters for Socialism, the Communists: that is, to firing from the wrong side of the barricades, as in the present outburst. As Marx noted in his "Communist Manifesto" already nearly a century ago:—

> The significance of Critical-Utopian Socialism and Communism bears an inverse relation to historical development. In proportion as the modern class struggle develops and takes definite shape, this fantastic standing apart from the contest, these fantastic attacks on it lose all practical value and all theoretical justification.

The controversy of Mr. Wells and the whole Fabian school or Liberal Reformist school of Socialism against Marxism is not a new one, and does not date from the Russian Revolution or from the foundation of the Communist Party of Great Britain. It has been continuously pursued by the whole Fabian school for over half a century. This assault on Marxism has always been conducted in the name of "freedom of thought," freedom from "orthodoxy," freedom from a "rigid party line" or "party dictators," etc. These phrases have always covered rejection of Marxism, rejection of the class struggle, rejection of the role of the working class in the fight for Socialism, and reliance on the role of isolated intellectuals, technicians and civil servants. The historical outcome has abundantly shown the complete incapacity of the Fabian method to achieve Socialism, and the success of the method of Bolshevism, that is, of the method of Marxism and of its political and organisational principles, of the method of Lenin and Stalin.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It may be useful to clear up certain specific misconceptions expressed in Mr. Wells' contribution.

First, in reference to "my talks to Lenin and Stalin" (revealing phrase—he came to teach Lenin and Stalin, for it could not occur to him that he might learn anything from them) he complains that some mysterious intervention of "industrious party dictators" had created a "veil of misunderstanding" to prevent the natural harmony of great minds, of Mr. Wells, Lenin and Stalin. Unfortunately the record, both of Lenin's comments on Mr. Wells after his departure, and the published stenographic record of the Stalin-Wells conversation, belie his interpretation. Stalin was compelled very patiently to explain some elementary principles of social understanding to his would-be teacher, and especially to explain something of the theory and practice of revolution and its role in social development, and the record shows that his explanation made as much impression on Mr. Wells as an explanation of the workings of an internal combustion engine would make on a kitten. The obstacle, however, was not the mysterious intervention of any anonymous party dictators which prevented Stalin from enjoying the full glory of the Wellsian illumination.

Second, Mr. Wells complains that "Lenin believed that the troubles in Ireland were a revolt of an industrial proletariat against Capitalism." Here, at least, is something specific. Unfortunately, precisely where he is specific, Mr. Wells exposes himself most completely. For the evidence is available to any reader to consult Lenin's very careful writings on the Irish question, especially in reference to the 1916 rising. Lenin was at considerable pains to teach the backward and narrow tendencies which were still strong in the Western Socialist movement to understand the national question, the significance of national liberation movements, with special reference to Ireland, the role of the peasantry, and the special role and tasks of the industrial working class minority in these conditions in a nationally subjected country. Mr. Wells' crude misrepresentation of Lenin's views only reveals his own incapacity to understand them.

Third, Mr. Wells, in endeavouring to prove "the mischief the Communist Party has done to mankind in the past third of a century," claims that "everywhere reaction has welcomed you." The truth of this has been abundantly shown by Axis Fascism, by the Anti-Comintern Pact, by Hitler, Mussolini, Franco, Pétain and all the leaders of reaction who have displayed their special "welcome" to Communism in singular and appropriate forms by directing their main fire against the Communists as the vanguard of the most consistent and indomitable fighters against Fascism and reaction.

No, Mr. Wells, you are firing on the wrong side in this outburst, against your friends and the best fighters for human freedom, and to help the enemy.

The deeper questions raised by Mr. Wells' contribution, with regard to party organisation and discipline, have been thrashed out in many controversies and published writings. The whole experience of the working-class movement and of the fight for Socialism has shown the necessity of a united political party of the working class, the party of a new type, such as tens of thousands of militant Socialists are endeavouring to build in the Communist Party in this country; the necessity of unity of theory and practice; of working-class organisation and discipline; of international unity and discipline; and the role which progressive intellectuals and fighters from all sections of society can play in such a united revolutionary party, based on the industrial working class, and armed with the weapons of Marxist theory and practice. Many intellectuals may not yet feel ready to take their place in the ranks of the Communist Party. They can still fulfil a progressive role in the many immediate issues of the present struggle. But they should understand the necessity of unity; they should understand their own helplessness as isolated individuals; they should seek to understand the role of the Communist Party rather than fight blindly against it.

Mr. Wells has shown an interest in the views of Lenin, even if he may not have always understood them aright. He might find it worth while to study Lenin's views on what Lenin called the "aristocratic anarchism" of the intellectual who demands "freedom" from the narrow

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bonds of a "rigid party line" or the "serfdom" of revolutionary working-class discipline and organisation:—

In its struggle for power the proletariat has no other weapon but organisation. Disunited by the rule of anarchic competition in the bourgeois world, ground down by forced labour for capital, constantly thrust back to the "lower depths" of utter destitution, savagery and degeneration, the proletariat can become, and inevitably will become, an invincible force only when its ideological unification by the principles of Marxism is consolidated by the material unity of an organisation which will weld millions of toilers into an army of the working class.

Marxism, the ideology of the proletariat trained by capitalism, has taught and is teaching unstable intellectuals to distinguish between the factory as a means of exploitation (discipline based on fear of starvation) and the factory as a means of organisation (discipline based on collective work united by the conditions of a technically highly developed form of production). The discipline and organisation which come so hard to the bourgeois intellectual are very easily acquired by the proletariat just because of this factory "schooling." Mortal fear of this school and utter failure to understand *its importance as an organising factor are characteristic* of the ways of thinking which reflect the petty-bourgeois mode of life and which gave rise to that species of anarchism which the German Social Democrats call *Edelanarchismus*, i.e., the anarchism of the "noble" gentleman, or aristocratic anarchism, as I would call it. The aristocratic anarchist thinks of the Party organisation as a monstrous "factory"; he regards the subordination of the part to the whole and of the minority to the majority as "serfdom"; division of labour under the direction of a centre evokes from him a tragi-comical outcry against people being transformed into "wheels and cogs"; mention of the organisational rules of the Party calls forth a contemptuous grimace and the disdainful remark (intended for the "formalists") that one could very well dispense with rules altogether. . . .

There is a close psychological connection between this hatred of discipline and that incessant nagging note of *injury* which is to be detected in all the writings of all opportunists to-day in general. . . . They are being persecuted, hounded, ejected, besieged and bullied. [Lenin in *One Step Forward, Two Steps Back.*]

It will be seen that the complaint about "organised yapping" and "industrious party dictators" is no new complaint of Mr. Wells against the bad behaviour of the Communist Party of Great Britain. It is the old complaint of opportunism against Marxism, of dilettantism against the serious critical methods of Marxism, of intellectual anarchism against the collective thought and practice of Marxist organisation—the old complaint which, in identical terms, Lenin had to deal with many years ago, and Marx before him, long before Mr. Wells had entered the arena of Socialist controversy.

An apology must be made to readers for the length of this reply. A controversy between Mr. Wells and the LABOUR MONTHLY would not have justified this space in the midst of urgent immediate issues; but the questions raised have some extended current interest and importance, especially at the present time when there is a wide awakening of interest in Marxism and the beginnings of an advance to the firm foundations of a mass Communist Party; and it was felt that a treatment of these issues might be helpful to the development of the movement.

Book Reviews

Indian Light on the Indian Problem

THERE IS no excuse now for not knowing something about India. Quite a number of informative pamphlets and studies have been issued this year. It is perhaps natural that the most useful should have been written by Indians. But it is also a sign of the times that they have a wider outlook and a fresher way of presenting things than most of the English ones.

Professor Gangulee's scholarly study* is not the best example, but it has many points of interest. Half his book is devoted to the path traversed by other countries in establishing a democratic constitution, notably France, the U.S.A., Ireland, the U.S.S.R., and the new states established in Europe after the last war. Unaccountably, he omits all reference to China. This is not a Marxist book, but just because the author has some knowledge of Marxism he is able to avoid the usual platitudes of academic political philosophy. In his historical picture and comparisons he does not hesitate to bring out the class basis in the establishment of bourgeois democracy.

Unfortunately, the professorial caution, which is evident in his treatment of the U.S.S.R., prevents him from going very deep in the application of his Marxist experience to India.

* *Constituent Assembly for India* by N. Gangulee (Allen & Unwin, 16s.).

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

For a real understanding of the political issue one must turn to Joshi's pamphlet.† For breadth of view, logical thought and vivid presentation nothing could excel it. It is the authoritative voice of a mighty living movement which knows that the future belongs to it.

Finally, one may mention two recent examples of informative pamphlets. For those who know nothing about India and would like a brightly written compendium of facts about the country and its problems, that by Matters can be recommended.‡ True, the author is not an Indian, but an Australian who has been a Labour M.P. He offers no solutions, but his sympathy for the Indian viewpoint is evident. For some of his factual material he seems to have culled freely, but without acknowledgement, from R. P. Dutt's *India Today*.

The other booklet** looks like a typical well-printed Oxford University Press school book. One expects old-fashioned, imperialist propaganda, but finds agreeably enough an intimate description that could only be written by an Indian, even though one who has closely assimilated British views. Its weakest feature is its simple acceptance of the India Office view of the Cripps negotiations and its echo of official complacency about India's war effort.

CLEMENS DUTT.

Guides to the Far East

Inside Asia by John Gunther: 1942 war edition (Hamish Hamilton, 12*s*. 6*d*.).

Russia, Japan and Mongolia by G. D. R. Phillips (Frederick Muller, cloth 4*s*., paper 2*s*. 6*d*.).

Japan and the Pacific Theatre of War by Jack Chen (Lawrence & Wishart, 1*s*.).

INSIDE ASIA is a light-weight book, but (with a caution) thoroughly worth reading. John Gunther is a lively American journalist who travels country after country, interviews personages, reads up the recent books, keeps his eyes open and snaps up unconsidered trifles. The result is that almost every chapter could be published as a newspaper despatch, whilst as a whole it is informative, interesting and far superior either to the usual formal study or the literary man's musings abroad. Gunther is another example of the new species, the journalist become author, of which the United States has given several, such as Edgar Snow or Anna Louisa Strong on this same subject of Asia. A man who begins a chapter with the sentence: "Mr. Gandhi, who is an incredible combination of Jesus Christ, Tammany Hall, and your father, is the greatest Indian since Buddha" has obviously been trained in American newspaper technique.

The defects of his method and outlook show themselves, particularly in his treatment of India, while of all relating to the U.S.S.R. in Asia he shows no grasp, and occasional prejudice. But on the personages and customs of Japan, Thailand, Indonesia and China (where his new edition oddly omits any treatment of Mao-tse-Tung) he provides an interesting Who's Who, together with just as much historical and other background as he considers his wide public can digest. Finally, he is a man who hates Fascism, wherever he finds it—in Europe or in Asia. In this new edition he has added much about Shintoist Japan, continued his story of China's heroic resistance, and has given an account of the first three months after Pearl Harbour of the war in the Far East, up to the fall of Singapore and the capture of Java.

The book by G. D. R. Phillips has a more limited scope and is really concerned with the Mongolian People's Republic where a small population, mainly of cattle-breeders, inhabit the vast space marked as Outer Mongolia in maps of Asia or China and are building up in those last few years both a new life for themselves and a bulwark against Japanese aggression. It is a strange story: how the Mongol horsemen of Jenghiz Khan and Kublai Khan, who conquered China, invaded India and swept across Europe to the Danube had by the eighteenth century become an exploited nomadic peasantry, oppressed by their priestly rulers and Chinese overlords; how in the twentieth century Tsarist Russia extended rapacious hands over Mongolia, and how from 1918 onwards became a *place d'armes* of the Japanese puppets, the Ataman Semenoff and the Baltic Baron Ungern, against the Soviets, until the rise of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party won them their independence. Since then, in the last twenty years, with the steady help and assistance of the U.S.S.R., a new life has built up for the Mongols, who showed themselves capable of solving their most pressing internal problems and of repelling, along with the Red Army, attacks of the Japanese on the Mongol-Manchurian border in summer, 1939. This story, together with the methods and designs of Japan in relation both to Mongolia and the U.S.S.R. recently and at the present time, is set forth clearly in a book which should be read widely now. In any subsequent edition an index would be desirable and maps indispensable.

Jack Chen's book is a manual for the Pacific theatre of war. Equipped with map, chronology, figures of resources, etc., it covers in seventy-five pages the Pacific panorama, the rise of Japan from feudalism to capitalism, in Fascist imperialism, the class forces within and the drive to war. Following the lines laid down in the 1927 Tanake Memorandum (which is more fully excerpted in Phillips), it describes the continental expansion of Japanese Imperialism, and then deals with the South Sea expansion into Indo-China, Thailand, Malaya, Burma, the Philippines and the Netherlands East Indies. It ends with the argument for the democratic offensive against Axis slavery being organised by freedom to India and the peoples on

† *The Indian Communist Party : Its Policy and Work in the War of Liberation* by P. C. Joshi. (C.P.G.B., 6*d*.).

‡ *India* by L. W. Matters. A Hurricane Book (*W. H. Allen & Co.*, 9*d*.)

** *India* by T. A. Raman. The World Today series (*Oxford University Press*, 3*s*. 6*d*.).

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the shores of the Pacific: in this way the lessons of Malaya and Burma can be learned and the mode of Chinese resistance copied effectively.

Concise, well arranged and politically clear.

R. PAGE ARNOT.

The Law and the War

The Law and Reconstruction by the Haldane Society. 4*d*.

THE LAW is rightly looked upon by the average worker as something to be avoided, and in its technicalities as dry. But many ordinary people are thrust into contact with it, in dealings with the landlord, the boss, and the police. So, too, they come in contact with it in matrimonial disputes and when injured at work. But there is a general feeling, well founded, that to obtain one's legal rights is expensive, and that the consumption of time, trouble and money by the machinery of the law is enormous.

All this is disadvantageous to the war effort, say a committee of the Haldane Society (the organisation of Socialist lawyers) in "The Law and Reconstruction" in that the feeling that justice is not obtainable except at great expense tends to "brown-off" members of the forces, and industrial workers, and that the waste of time entailed in litigation is particularly undesirable to-day.

The pamphlet puts forward striking proposals (said by the authors to be suitable for adoption even in war-time) for reforms in workmen's compensation law, in the provision of free legal aid for poor persons, and in various technical matters.

One of the most attractive suggestions for expedition and simplification is that undefended divorce causes should be tried in county courts.

The treatment of the various subjects discussed shows a good understanding of the worker's problems in connection with the law, and the language used is readable and non-technical.

This pamphlet touches on subjects which are seldom dealt with in Labour literature, and should provide very attractive food for discussion.

It should be mentioned in favour of the authors that they appear to have been careful to avoid "post-war blue-printing."

STEPHEN MURRAY.

Shorter Notices

Science and World Order by J. G. Crowther, O. J. R. Howarth and D. P. Riley. A Penguin Special. (9*d*.)

AN ACCOUNT for the layman of the International Conference arranged by the British Association for the Advancement of Science. In defining the role of science throughout the world after the war, the Conference, representing "the intellectual encirclement of Germany," emphasised the futility of making future plans regardless of the present situation. A scientific management of society may develop only with everyman's interest in science and its possibilities, since the business of government is the concern of every citizen.

VIVIENNE KENRICK.

Christians in the Class Struggle by Gilbert Cope. With an Introduction by the Bishop of Bradford. (C.C.M.C.O. Publication, 6*d*.)

Annual Report of the Industrial Christian Fellowship, 1941-42. 2*d*.

The Malvern Torch, November, 1942. Edited by Sidney Dark. 4*d*.

MR. COPE'S pamphlet is an interesting attempt to show Socialist Christians how their belief may be reconciled with Marxist conceptions on class struggle and the revolutionary solution of social and economic crisis. Though glanced as only an introduction to this theme, it grows in writing into a more or less full treatment, but at the expense of a sufficiently full explanation of Marxist concepts and terms for minds presumed innocent of any guilty knowledge of Marx. It concludes with a quite un-Marxist programme of action, but no bibliography whereby its non-Marxist readers may strengthen their understanding. For all that, this is a promising piece of work and one of some value for active Marxists uncertain of the method of approach to Christian prejudice.

The Industrial Christian Fellowship is conducting the campaign around the social reform programme produced by the 1941 Malvern Conference, having the new Archbishop of Canterbury as generalissimo. As evidence of unease amongst churchpeople, this body's work is significant. But its social reformist and inalterably capitalistic basis contains obvious dangers for the working-class movement. The inclusion of that notorious landlord and crank, the Duke of Bedford, amongst its Council members is an instructive circumstance.

T.B.

The Editor of LABOUR MONTHLY will be very glad to receive contributions in the form of finished articles or of suggestions and data for articles. The customary proviso must be made that no responsibility is undertaken for manuscripts sent to him nor can he promise to enter into correspondence regarding contributions not accepted.

The articles in the LABOUR MONTHLY are indexed in the International Index to Periodicals, New York City, U.S.A., as well as in the annual index in each December issue.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: 12 months, 7s., 6 months 3s. 6d. Postage paid.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LABOUR MONTHLY DEVELOPMENT FUND

Amount received during November, 1942: £73 : 17 : 5

TEN POUNDS MORE . . .

Up to the time of going to press we have received only ten pounds more this month than last. We are hoping that all our good friends are saving up to send us a really worthwhile Christmas present. "I happened upon L.M. one day in a bookstall," writes a reader, "and have delighted in its truth and realism ever since." Another new reader asks us to accept his first contribution, "which definitely won't be the last." These tributes from readers who have only recently discovered our paper are the best encouragement we can have that it is spreading its influence and getting into the right places. Among many others, an airman writes: "L.M. is always a great, and needed, source of mental stimulation up here in the wilds." Several, but not nearly enough, readers, intimate in varying styles that they have tended to forget the Fund while absorbing L.M.'s contents. Will others please absorb ALL the contents and then they will not be able to forget the Fund.

	£	s.	d.
J. Melrick		1	0
T. C. Russell		2	6
G. E. Philibert		13	0
M. Philibert	1	0	0
H. Levitt		8	0
Samuel Mill		10	0
L. M. Stevens		1	6
B. Farrington		3	0
Rickard		7	0
A. C. Grabham		3	0
E. E. Ashworth		3	0
E. Morton		3	0
M. Shacklock		7	0
"H.L." (Leicester)		5	0
D. A. Hamilton		8	0
P.E.M.		3	0
N. Kelly		3	6
Darton D.G.		7	6
W. A. Burbridge		1	6
G. Ramsay		6	6
S. Taylor		14	0
Signalmaster		10	0
"Q.Z."		4	0
L. F. Blore	2	0	0
J. Parrott		13	0
J. J. Christie		7	0
S. H. Fomison		13	0
"J.P."		2	6
D. Robinson		3	0
J. P. Carruthers		3	0
"G.W.S.R."		8	10
M. Christopher		2	6
R. V. Hill		2	6
C. F. C. Padel		13	0
G. P. Bugden		13	0
Mrs. McGregor		3	0
Canvey Island D.G.		1	6
Holborn D.G.		11	3
Northallerton D.G.		1	6
H. Hearn		2	6
G. M. Bussy		8	0
C. H. B. Locke		13	0
W. Bryn Thomas		3	0
H. Rosen		3	0
F. Bennett		8	0
D. Brenner		13	0
Red Tankman		5	0
A. & B. Muskett	1	0	0
B. Gillingham		3	0
L. Barnes		14	0
H. Hodson		13	0
F. Brown		13	0
D. J. P. Rees		10	0
Edinburgh D.G.		8	6
Amal. Press D.G.		5	0
W. Ellison		3	0
G. M. Driver		14	0
John Scott		3	6
J. McLean		2	6
J. Sherar		5	6
Another Sailor		7	3
Red Soldier		2	6
H. Farrow		2	0
F. Chesterton		1	6
G. W. Hasted		6	6
Penrith D.G.		10	0
"J.G."		2	6
Shoreham D.G.		3	0
A. Edwards		3	0
L. Gibbins	1	0	0
E. M. Thomas		3	0
Royston Green		2	6
R. Morgan		3	0
Red Bunting		7	0
E. Morgan		3	0
W. T. Evans		3	0
L. McGregor	1	15	0
J. P. Ellis		3	6
L'Humanite		2	0
R.R.R., N.W.3	1	0	0
F. & J. Gubb	2	10	0
T. C. Russell		3	0
S. Hunter		7	0
B. Grundy		13	0
W. Hoey		1	0
B. Rothman		3	0
C. Robson		5	0
A.R.M.		5	0
R.F.B.	2	0	0
Convalescent Ex-Servicemen		10	0
"J.B."		5	0
"H.S.M."		3	6
Anon, W.1	1	0	0
E. M. Ruffell		3	0
L. Dow	1	0	0
R. Colbran		3	0
M. L. Scott	1	3	0
A. E. Owen		13	0
R. B. Sleep		2	6
Clifton D.G.		6	0
Anon, Whitchurch		1	0
Red Solicitor		10	0
Druzya Uchitiellya		10	0
E. Ferrisey		3	0
R. Henry		3	0
J. E. Evans		3	0
Socialist Sailor	2	10	0
Nov. 7		7	0
Anniversary of 1917	5	11	4
M. Christopher	1	0	0
Colindale D.G.		2	0
A. McMillan		3	6
H. Millar		6	4
L. A. Leeds		2	6
Forest Gate D.G.		5	0
Two R.A.F. Readers		10	0
B. Evans		7	0
E. D. McCallum		5	0
J. Rees		3	0
R.A.		2	6
A. Slessor		3	0
A. Wall		5	0
H. A. Flint		2	5
Twenty-five Sixpences		12	6
W. F. Lakin-Smith		5	6
T. N. Hogg		0	6
Mr. Livingstone		7	0
D. N. Pritt	2	0	0
F. S. Price		13	0
D. Robinson		2	6
S. L. Lawrence		3	0
D. F. Oakeshott		8	0
F. Pawson		3	0
R. Pearson		2	6
G. E. Philibert		10	0
A. R. Watson		14	0
Mrs. Harding		3	0
R. V. Hill		2	6
Red Airman		4	3
L. G. Phildius	1	0	0
D. J. P. Rees		13	0
B. Walker		2	6
G. Sargent		10	0
T.W.R.	1	0	0
W. Gordon		6	6
S. G. Howell		1	6
P. W. Brian		2	3
R.R., N.W.11		10	0
C. Meldon		3	0
D.29 R. A.S.C.		3	0
W. Duthie		4	0
K. Findlay		2	6
E. J. Wynburne		3	0
D. Hughes		6	0

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

". . . All these facts point to a progressive rapprochement between the U.S.S.R., Great Britain and the United States of America and to their

uniting in a fighting alliance"

KNOWLEDGE INCREASES UNITY.

HOW THE SOVIET STATE IS RUN

Pat Sloan has written a new last chapter on recent developments. **Pat Sloan 2/6**

BRITISH TRADE UNIONISM

Now includes the war period — production drive and struggle for unity. **Allen Hutt 2/6**

LAWRENCE & WISHART, LIMITED

2, Southampton Place · London · W.C.1

NEW *Labour Monthly* PUBLICATIONS

TWENTY-FIVE YEARS. The Significance of the Russian Revolution. *By* R. PALME DUTT - - - - **2d.**

THE WAR COMES FIRST. A selection of articles from the Soviet Press depicting the mobilisation of the civilian front in the war against Hitlerite Germany. *Preface by* IVOR MONTAGU. 64 pages - - - - - **9d.**

KARL MARX. His Apprenticeship to Politics, 1842. *By* Prof. ROY PASCAL (*Forthcoming shortly*) - - **1s.**

PATRIOTS OF FRANCE. *By* An Unnamed Frenchman - - - - - - - - - **2d.**

ZERO HOUR: 2nd FRONT. *By* IVOR MONTAGU - **3d.**

INDIA: WHAT MUST BE DONE. *By* R. PALME DUTT - - - - - - - - - **3d.**

JAPAN. *By* R. PAGE ARNOT - - - - - **3d.**

From Bookshops or *Labour Monthly*, 134 Ballards Lane, London, N.3

Published by the Proprietors, The Trinity Trust, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3, and printed by Ecram, Spencer & Co. Ltd., London, E.C.4.

PRODUCED 2003 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED